LAY-PREACHING IN ENGLAND
FROM THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION TO THE RISE OF METHODISM:
A STUDY IN ITS DEVELOPMENT, ITS CHARACTER AND SIGNIFICANCE

submitted by

James H. Blackmore

in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of Ph. D.

University of Edinburgh

1951

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD

Herein is presented a study of lay-preaching in England from the time of the Protestant Reformation to the beginning of the Wesleyan Revival, with emphasis upon its development as a general movement, its main characteristics and problems, the debate which it caused and the place which it found within the Congregational, Baptist and Quaker denominations; we shall note its varied progress and adjustments, and conclude with an evaluation of its significance.

The term lay-preachers is applied to the men and women (laici) who, without ordination or any other public service of recognition or ecclesiastical authorization setting them aside as regular ministers, undertook to preach or publicly declare (praedicare) religious beliefs and practices. The term was used rarely during the period of our study; gifted men or private men was preferred, as the distinction of clergy and laity was associated with Roman usage. While we do not care to argue with the writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who spoke of "the public preaching of private persons," we shall use the term lay-preaching simply to mean the preaching of those who were not ministers. For the purposes of this treatise we shall recognize any ordination which was used or accepted by a religious group or society as establishing a definite or official ministry; the distinction of lay-preachers must rest upon their having no ecclesiastical ordination* for their preaching, and when, late in our study, they were given a semi-official place within three denominations and were set apart as messengers or evangelists, their distinction came to rest upon the

* They were to claim a spiritual ordination.

partial nature of their religious work and the continuation of their secular trade or calling. Our study is restricted to England, with the exceptions of the significant developments among the English exiles in Holland and the characteristic practices of the English army in Scotland. We have endeavored to cover the period from the time when England broke from Rome in 1535 to the eve of the Wesleyan Revival in 1738, with an introductory chapter of the medieval background or inheritance.

It is hoped that the reader will remember that these two hundred years were filled with wars, revolutions, plots and strife which inflamed passions and prejudices which have not died out even unto this day; it is hoped that the reader will remember the difficulty in finding one's way through the mountains of pamphlets and books of the seventeenth century alone and will bear with the writer in trying to glimpse a clear view of that company of men who were neither prophets nor the sons of prophets.* We have not presented any theory about them, nor endeavored to defend or condemn them; we have tried to present them as they appeared, to describe the witness they bore and to examine the records they left behind them. We have felt it necessary to give a great deal of the political and religious history which influenced their development and decline, as these changes hardly would be intelligible apart from them. At times we have feard reopening old disputes and stirring up old hostilities, but it is hoped that in this story of the past some lessons might be learned to enable us better to maintain a spirit of unity in the bonds of peace.

As no man can be completely free of prejudice or bias, I always have thought it honorable for a writer to tell something of his background, special interest in his subject, the reactions he experienced

* Amos 7:14.

during the writing and his concluding thoughts; these may, or may not, have influenced him, but they are honest warnings to his friends. Having had no direct experience of lay-preaching nor any contacts with lay-preachers, my interest in this subject began in Germany at the close of the late war, when as an American chaplain I heard of the hardships which the Protestant churches experienced whenever their pastors were drafted. As a Baptist, with the tradition of the priesthood of believers behind me, I inquired of the activities of lay-leaders and was disappointed when I heard of the few which the churches afforded. In thinking of the future and wondering what methods and means might be evolved should the Christian churches be persecuted again, I thought that one answer might lie in the training and use of lay-preachers. Thinking that history might present some valuable experiences in this regard, I intimated a desire to study the Baptist lay-preachers of the seventeenth century when I matriculated at the University of Edinburgh; it was suggested that I cover the whole subject of lay-preaching in England from the Reformation to the Wesleyan Revival. At first I was reluctant to undertake such a big subject for a thesis of this nature, but as I studied the material I realized that here was a general movement of lay-preaching, stretching from Wycliffe to Wesley, which has been largely ignored by modern scholars;* I found that the Puritan denominations were so interrelated that it would be difficult to isolate the development of lay-preaching within one of them. I became fascinated by the debate involving the freedom of preaching which continued throughout half a century and which had important consequences for the freedom of conscience, speech

* Geoffrey F. Nuttall's The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience and William Haller's The Rise of Puritanism are fine exceptions.

and press. These considerations have held me to this vast undertaking, although at times I weakened and intimated a desire to limit the subject. It is hoped that the scope of our work will be taken into consideration and will justify its abnormal length.* At first I tried to use English spelling, but as I feard that it would be inconsistent, I have used American spelling as preferred in the Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (4th ed., 1935) and standard American grammar.** I have followed, with slight modification, the form for dissertations recommended by the University of Chicago.

My indebtedness extends to many people. I am especially grateful to my advisers, the Rev. Principal Charles Duthie and the Rev. J. B. Primrose, for their many helpful suggestions and patient supervision. I also desire to express my appreciation of the initial advice given by the Rev. Principal John Baillie and the Rev. Principal Emeritus Hugh Watt. I shall never forget the kindness and courtesy shown me during the past two years in the libraries of Scotland and England; I am especially grateful to Miss Edna Leslie of New College (library) for lending me her late father's unpublished notes on Cromwell's chaplains and to Dr. Irene J. Churchill of the Lambeth Library for assisting me during the present restoration of their building. Also I wish to thank the directors of the British Museum and the National Library of Scotland and the librarians of the Bodleian and Dr. Williams' libraries. I am grateful to Dr. F. Townsend Lord, President of the Baptist World Alliance, and to Professor Ernest A. Payne of Oxford for their encouragement and advice; nor can I

* The first writing was over 1200 typed pages.

** One of the chief differences being in a collective noun taking a singular verb, as "the government is" instead of "the government are."

omit mention of the many friendly talks I have shared with my fellow students who were working on related subjects, especially Garth Legge, Ivan Hoy and John Tufft. I have often read, with a mild scepticism, a man's acknowledgments to his wife, but now I well know what lies behind the words "without whose help this work could not have been completed."

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

MEDIEVAL BACKGROUND AND INHERITANCE

INTRODUCTION

I. PREACHING FRIARS IN ENGLAND
   - A. Early Franciscans as itinerant evangelists
   - B. Dominicans as champions of orthodoxy
   - C. Popularity of Friars' preaching
   - D. Conflicts with secular clergy
   - E. Changes and decay

II. WYCLIFFE AND HIS FOLLOWERS
   - A. Emphasis upon Bible and the individual
   - B. Importance of preaching
   - C. Institution of itinerant preachers
   - D. Question of lay-preachers
   - E. Characteristics of his preachers
   - F. His heresy and repression

III. THE LOLLARD PREACHER AND OTHER IRREGULARS
   - A. Thorpe's testimony
   - B. Later developments
   - C. Pardoners, hermits and others

IV. LAWS REGULATING PREACHING
   - A. Rigid system of licenses
   - B. Condemnation of lay-preaching
   - C. Medieval concept of society
   - D. Results of these laws
   - E. Persistence of Lollardry

RECAPITULATION

When Wesley's laymen began preaching at market-crosses and on the hill-sides, they were denounced as innovators, while they were actually reviving a practice, the roots of which reached back into the Middle Ages. Decrying the effort of some to lay claim to the whole of medieval tradition while others repudiate it entirely, B. L. Manning describes the medieval Church as "the mother of us all."[1] No one party holds a monopoly of the medieval inheritance, for we all are heirs to its culture and traditions, including even those who have renounced it and least suspect their indebtedness.

Neither Wesley's preachers nor the lay-preachers of our study showed any awareness that they even knew of any in the medieval church who might be called their predecessors or precursors. Had they known of such, the lay-preachers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries would have repudiated all relation to them, not only because of their hostility to everything Catholic but also because they grounded their authority to preach in a fresh personal experience. At the time of the Reformation when their existence depended upon their distinction from the Roman tradition, it was not strange that they sought no continuity with the past. Seeking a revival of primitive Christianity, they ignored the intervening centuries and presented the old faith as something newly found.

1. Bernard Lord Manning, The People's Faith in the Time of Wyclif (Cambridge: University Press, 1919), 188.

From our vantage point, we can see striking similarities in the conditions which called forth the itinerant preachers of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries and those of the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries, as well as those in the eighteenth century. There are characteristics of person, message and style of preaching which are common to them all; they all met with popular approval as well as hostility from the established ecclesiastics. There were, of course, pronounced differences: the preaching friars were accepted within the church, while the Lollards were driven out; the "tub-preachers" were slandered and outlawed, while the Wesleyans were only frowned upon. We need not emphasize any actual connection between these various groups; it is sufficient, for our purpose, to note their likeness, as each came forth with a freshness of message and a courage which arose in religious devotion.

Writing of English Puritanism, within which the majority of the preachers of our study arose, Trevelyan claims that the origins of many of its distinctive traits -- such as its asceticism, its vigorous sermons, its appeal to the poor and lowly -- are all to be found in the medieval church, and particularly in the work of the friars; and not of the friars alone, continues Trevelyan, "clerk Langland was Bunyan's forerunner, and Wycliffe would have found his ideal of priesthood realized by Latimer and Wesley."[1] Speaking of the similarity of Piers the Plowman and Pilgrim's Progress, Manning says, "this came by no accident; here is no

1. G. M. Trevelyan, English Social History (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947), 46.

chance resemblance, but a family likeness," an opinion aptly justified by Owst's careful study.[1] If this is true of these literary works, the same might well be supposed in the relation of the pulpit and preaching, as Dr. John Brown does suggest that the friars might be considered the pulpit-forerunners of the nonconforming Puritans of the seventeenth century.[2] Again G. R. Owst fortifies this opinion by saying:

> Where these [the friars] had preached through fields and streets, at market crosses, perhaps in the 'natural amphitheatre of Gwennap,' there later could others -- Bunyan, Fox, Wesley, Whitefield, and a host of the nameless -- preach freely too, especially when once more the parish pulpits were to be closed against the unconventional itinerating evangelist. The lesson was obviously never forgotten. For here we deal with no mere external coincidence of history, but rather with a potent, undying influence.[3]

Of the first Franciscans who landed at Dover on the tenth of September, 1224, Moorman says that they were men after St. Francis' own heart, who had come to show "that the Gospel could best be preached to the poor by the poor, to hold up before the world a reflection of the days when Christ and His Apostles walked among the Galilean hills."[4] They were only nine men, four clerics and five laymen; Richard of Ingworth was the only priest among them;

1. Manning, op. cit., p. 188. Vide G. R. Owst, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England (Cambridge: University Press, 1933), 56-109.
2. John Brown, Puritan Preaching in England (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1900), 16.
3. G. R. Owst, Preaching in Medieval England (Cambridge: University Press, 1926), 93.
4. John Richard Humpidge Moorman, Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century (Cambridge: University Press, 1946), 318.

Agnellus who was designed as their minister was only in deacon's orders; Lawrence of Beauvais to whom St. Francis had given his own habit was one of the laymen. St. Francis, whom Ernest Renan described as "the one perfect christian"[1] had been only a young merchant of twenty-four, with no clerical or academical training, when he heard a voice saying: "Go, and build my Church again." Only in 1207 had he been ordained a deacon, and then "apparently without desiring it."[2] Many of his early followers came directly from the laity, having renounced all to become Christ's beggars and messengers. The command to the Seventy (Luke 10:1-16) became their model; and they called themselves Fratres Minores, for none could be less than they . Differing from the monk who in his cloister had nothing to do with ministering to others, the friar was "an itinerant evangelist, always on the move."[3] Speaking of the Franciscans, Jessop says:

> One is tempted to say it was a mere accident that these men were not sectaries, so little in common had they with the ecclesiastics of the time, so entirely did they live and labour among the laity of whom they were and with whom they so profoundly sympathized.[4]

Within his fraternity, St. Francis had included a class of laymen, the Tertiaries, who although not prepared to embrace the vows of poverty were well-wishers who visited the sick and needy, engaged in the work of teaching or accompanied the preachers when advisable, and bound by their engagement to set an example of sobriety and

1. 'Le seul parfait Chrêtien', Renan, Nonvelles Etudes d' Historie Religiense, p. 334, as quoted by Moorman, op. cit., p. 396.
2. Augustus Jessopp, Coming of the Friars (London: Ernest Benn, 1888), 16.
3. Ibid., p. 19. Vide also pp. 10-13.
4. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

seriousness in their dress and manners. The work among the poor at first startled the upper classes, and then fascinated them; while labouring to save the lowest, the Franciscans "took captive the highest."[1] Scholars came and were shocked that they were not allowed to carry their books with them. "Not a Breviary? not even the Psalms of David?" they asked unbelievingly. The answer was:

> 'Get them into your heart of hearts, and provide yourself with a treasure in the heavens. Who ever heard of Christ reading books save when He opened the book in the synagogue, and then closed it and went forth to teach the world for ever?'[2]

They preached little theology; their message was simply Christ. Having no system, they defended no views; they combated no opinions; they took no side. In the vulgar speech, "rugged, plastic, and reckless of grammar," they preached the message of glad tidings of great joy.[3] When they first went to Oxford, they regarded the university as "a place where there was hope of a 'good catch of souls'."[4] These earliest Franciscans, according to Trevelyan, made

> a great religious revival among the poor, comparable in more ways than one to the Puritan, Wesleyan and Salvation Army movements. In the spirit of their founder, they sought out the poorest, the most neglected, the diseased, especially in the slums of the larger towns . . .[5]

The Dominicans had preceded the Franciscans to England by two years. Unlike the Franciscans, they were all trained men of education; addressing themselves mainly to the educated classes,

1. Jessopp, op. cit., p. 22.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 29.
4. Dr. Little, The Friars and the Faculty of Theology at Cambridge, in "Melanges Mandonnet", ii, p. 396, as quoted by Moorman, op. cit., p. 370.
5. George Macaulay Trevelyan, History of England (3rd ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945), 184-185.

they preached in Latin. Their founder had started his career as an Augustinian canon and priest; his purpose was to save the church from the assaults of heresy; his plan was to have an order of trained defenders. As the determined champion of orthodoxy, Dominic thought heresy could best be overcome by preaching. "Preach the word in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort" — that was his panacea. When the Dominicans came to England, they headed for Oxford where soon they were training young men to serve as evangelists, "furnished with all the tricks of dialectic fence, and practised to extempore speaking on the most monentous subjects."[1] Nothing is said of the gospel of poverty among the early Friar Preachers, as Dominic's followers were called; it seems that it was in rivalry with the Franciscans that the Black Friars were driven to embrace poverty, while the Franciscans were forced to change their views on education. In the early days men of the peasant status came into both orders, but in the later part of the thirteenth century it seems that recruits came mostly from the merchants and tradespeople of the towns and from the Universities.

In understanding the popularity of the friars' preaching, it must be remembered that Christianity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was "an oral religion,"[2] which was taught by word of mouth rather than by the written word. Nevertheless, it seems that the parish priests were seldom competent to preach, while

1. Jessopp, op. cit., p. 33.
2. Manning, op. cit., p. 1.

the higher clergy was too busy with matters of Church and State to be bothered with much preaching, and monks were secluded in their cells or hurried by on their pilgrimages. Religion became chiefly a matter of the sacraments; a sermon was an event, especially in the country areas where a gifted preacher was looked upon as a prophet sent by God. When the friars came into a village and let it be known that they were going to preach, "the whole population would turn out to listen."[1] These fratres exeuntes or wandering preachers, whom Pecham describes as "the wheels of God's chariot," knew the hardships and temptations of the people they addressed; "they were not afraid to castigate the vices of all classes, and to insist on the performance of duties; they gave courage to the poor and oppressed."[2] Their reputation as popular preachers quickly spread and people flocked to hear them. Describing the influence exercised by the quality of their lives no less than by the power of their words, Moorman says:

> . . . men were brought into a new and far more intimate relationship with God; they began to realise how much God cared for each of them, and that it was to save ordinary people like themselves that Christ came into the world. The effect of this upon the religious life of the country was profound. Whatever aspect of practical or mystical religion we study, the impact of the friars in the earlier part of the thirteenth century is felt. In the Universities and in the country lanes, in city slum and on village green, in the castles of the rich and in the hovels of the poor, everywhere the friars made their influence felt, and the country was the richer and the happier for the new hope and strength which were grafted into its spiritual life.[3]

1. Jessopp, op. cit., p. 86.
2. A. G. Little, Studies in English Franciscan History (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1917), 156-157. For Pecham's phrase, vide Pecham "Tractatus Pauperis" (Brit. Soc. Fr. Studies, ii, p. 24).
3. Moorman, op. cit., p. 389.

Having contacts with the mean and vulgar in country lanes and crowded areas, the friar contributed that bright familiarity and raciness which held the attention of the masses. Owst says that even the friar's Latin homilies retain "their little popular idioms of speech, saws and couplets, preserved in the vernacular along with the old wives' fables so dear to the common heart,"[1] while his moralized story and miracle book became models for sermon-writers. The friars also introduced into popular preaching the class-room methods of logical divisions and of pretty formality which were pleasing to learned and fashionable audiences. Their preaching came to rival the importance of the sacraments so that at the Council of Lyons in 1274 the seculars complained that the people were preferring the short masses of the friars and neglecting the ordinary services. Dr. Little quotes St. Bernardino of Siena as advising: "'If of these two things you can only do one — either hear the mass or hear the sermon — you should let the mass go rather than the sermon.'"[2] Little attributes the increase in church-going during the later Middle Ages to the influence of the friars.[3] By enhancing the importance of the pulpit, Trevelyan says that the friars prepared the way for those who were to replace and destroy them; "they brought religion to the common people, endeavouring to make it intelligible to their minds and influential over their lives."[4]

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 313.
2. Little, Studies, etc., p. 133.
3. Ibid.
4. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 185.

Such popularity and power, as the friars came to have, aroused the jealousy and resentment of the parochial clergy. Although the bishops might favor the friars in hope of their bringing new life and vigor into the parishes and accordingly provide them with licenses as preachers, the local clergymen were apt to regard the friars as intruders in their dominion. The parish priest was not happy to find an empty church on a Sunday morning while his flock assembled on the village green to enjoy the racy stories and pulpit oratory of some wandering friar.[1] In addition to being rivals for the attention of the people, the friars were rivals in hearing confessions and in burying the dead; both of which were remunerative. Dr. Little speaks of "a series of unedifying squabbles between friars and rectors of churches for the possession of corpses," and quotes Rishanger's Chronicle, which says that the friars "hung round the corpses of wealthy men like dogs round carrion, each waiting greedily for his bit."[2] These quarrels between the friars and the seculars became so disturbing to the peace of the church that in 1300 the Pope issued a bull, Super Cathedram, which gave the friars the right to preach in their own churches and in public places, but prohibited them from forcing their way into the parish churches.[3] An elaborate body of legislation was enacted to safeguard the situation: the Mendicant preacher was not to preach in the parish church itself without the rector's permission; neither was he to preach to parishioners in some other spot, when the rector or his chosen substitute wished to

1. Moorman, op. cit., p. 390.
2. Little, Studies, etc., p. 110.
3. Moorman, op. cit., p. 393.

address them, or if the prelates had convoked their clergy for the same time of day.[1] There were also rules laid down for the regulation of hearing confessions and conducting funerals.

The glory of the friars, says Moorman, belongs wholly to the thirteenth century. Up to the year 1250 the friars symbolized "the purest and most virile aspect of the church's work in this country;" but by the end of the century, a decay had set in which went so rapidly and deeply that by the time of Langland, Chaucer and Wycliffe the friars had become "an object of contempt in the eyes of thoughtful people."[2] Chaucer laughed at

> the hypocritical devices of 'brothers' who made gain out of popular superstition while pretending to observe rules of evangelical poverty; and the pious and orthodox Gower could write of the friars: 'Incest, flattery and hypocrisy and pandering to vices, these are the qualities have raised their minsters, their steeples and their cloisters.'[3]

The extensive building schemes, the growth of luxurious habits (even to the extent of keeping servants), the renting out of the privilege of begging, the constant quarrelling over precedence and prestige between the two orders and the bitter strife between friar and secular priest — were indications that "the true apostolic spirit" was sinking into its embers, "while the institution survived."[4] The behavior of the friars became such that not only the local priest but also the people came to dread, rather than to welcome, their coming. Although in the fourteenth century they still shouldered

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 72-73.
2. Moorman, op. cit., p. 366.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 186.
4. Ibid. Vide also Moorman, op. cit., pp. 386-401 for discussion of the changes and decay.

most of the missionary work of the church and had a strong popular following, and although during the fifteenth century they were to see their Lollard enemies crushed, yet by the time "when the storm of the Reformation broke they were almost without friends."[1] Their hard-won popularity and well-earned reputation were dissipated when they lost "touch with the deeper religious life and needs of the masses," and, as Owst says, "the mysterious mantle of prophecy received by their humble and heroic predecessors" gradually slipped "from them on to other shoulders — those of the mystical hermit and his kind, of the Lollard, and soon of others 'smelling somewhat of the pan.'"[2] Of the time when the familiar grey and black-gowned figures who had created the demand for preaching were no longer seen upon the roads of England, tapping at the cottage door or speaking to an audience of rustics in the village-square, Trevelyan says, "their functions were in part taken over by 'hot gospellers' and itinerant Protestant preachers."[3]

John Wycliffe and his "poor preachers" constitute a second portion of our medieval inheritance, an understanding of which will be profitable to our study of lay-preaching in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. During the fourteenth century the Church was at a low ebb; sensitive spirits were troubled by its corruptions and abuses. The clergy became the target of much criticism and satire;

1. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 186.
2. Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 228-229.
3. Trevelyan, Social History, p. 108.

the friars' preaching stood in marked contrast to the mute prelates, whom Wycliffe described as 'waterless clouds' and Langland called 'dumb hounds.'[1] The Franciscan Nicholas Philip asked:

> '. . . where, . . . will you find many of the priests of to-day? Think you, mourning between the porch and the altar? Assuredly, I fear, in no wise, but rather playing lasciviously around the prostitute and brothel-house: nor by any means praying in the choir, but in truth wandering about the market-place; nor in the sanctuary, . . . but rather in the tavern and ale-house, where sometimes they imbibe so much that they can say neither vespers, nor matins properly.'[2]

Despairing of a reformation of these abuses from within the Church, Wycliffe became an ecclesiastico-political reformer and called upon the lay-power of the state to reform an unwilling clergy. Developing his doctrine of "dominion by grace,"[3] the Oxford professor arrived at the conclusion that "kings may take away temporalities from ecclesiastical persons habitually abusing them."[4] Such doctrines brought the wrath of Rome, and in 1378 Wycliffe was forbidden to teach them; however, Wycliffe had emerged as a "national champion against the Papacy" and had spoken the national feeling against the abuses of the Church at home, and the Pope hesitated to punish so popular a hero.[5] Shortly afterwards the Church was to be involved in the Papal schism

1. Vide Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 39-40. The source of these famous figures of speech is, of course, Biblical: II Peter 2:17 and Isaiah 56:10-11.
2. As quoted by Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 249-250.
3. "He (th)at stoni(th) in grace is verrey lord of (th)ingis; and whoever faili(th) by defaute of grace, he faili(th) ri(z)t title of (th)ing (th)at he occupie(th), and unabli(th) himsilf to have (th)e goodis of God." Wyclif, Select English Writings, ed. by Herbert E. Winn, (Oxford: University Press, 1929), 62.
4. Rev. Hastings Rashdall, "Wycliffe," Dictionary of National Bibliography, ed. Sidney Lee, Vol. LXIII (1900), 209.
5. George Macaulay Trevelyan, England in the Age of Wycliffe (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1899), 81 and 172.

which gave Wycliffe the freedom

> to move out of the groove already marked out by the politico-ecclesiastical debates of the fourteenth-century schools, and to question not merely the accidental abuses of the existing church system, but its underlying principles and the theological doctrines upon which they were based.[1]

As against the authority of the church, Wycliffe began "the great protestant appeal of Scripture;"[2] he employed the Bible as the standard of truth in judging doctrine, ecclesiastical custom and institution; "'Christ's law is best and enough,'" he said, "'and other laws men should not take, but as branches of God's law.'"[3] However, as Trevelyan points out, the Bible was not the sole basis of his doctrine and his sole canon of appeal;[4] Wycliffe himself intimates as much in his words on the wonders accomplished by the preaching of the word, which "could never be wrought by the word of a priest, if the heat of the Spirit of Life and the Eternal Word did not above all things else work with it."[5] At one time in the development of his thought (1376), he held Reason and the interpretation of the Holy Church doctors as approved by the church to be two indispensable guides to the Scripture; but a few years later he simply said, "'the Holy Ghost teaches us the meaning of Scripture, as Christ opened the Scriptures to the apostles.'"[6] Rejecting the Romish division of the

1. Rashdall, op. cit., p. 210.
2. Ibid., p. 211
3. Wycliffe, as quoted by Winn, op. cit., p. 6.
4. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 249.
5. Vide Herbert B. Workman, John Wyclif. A Study of the English Medieval Church (2 vols., Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1926), II, 210.
6. Gotthard Lechler, John Wycliffe and His English Precursors, trans. Peter Lorimer, (new ed., revised; London: Religious Tract Society, 1884), 244. Vide pp. 243-250 for further discussion of this most interesting aspect of Wycliffe's thought. Also p. 243 for reference to relation of Waldensian lay-preaching and their appeal to Scripture.

Church into the clergy and laity, according to which the laity had only to hear and obey -- Wycliffe taught that "everyman is God's tenant-in-chief,"[1] with no intermediary between the individual and God. He recognized the Presbyters and Deacons in the church of the Apostles, but made no difference between Presbyter and Bishop; he came to deny more and more strongly the 'jus divinum' of the papacy. Condemning those who claim that the knowledge imparted by the priests is sufficient, Wycliffe called the Holy Scripture

> '. . . the faith of the church, and the more widely its true meaning becomes known the better it will be. Therefore, since the laity should know the faith, it should be taught in whatever language is most easily comprehended. . . . Christ and His Apostles taught the people in the language best known to them. . . . Further, since all Christians, as the Apostle teaches in 2 Cor. v. 10, must stand before Christ's tribunal and give an account of all the gifts He bestowed upon them, it is necessary that all the faithful should know those gifts and their use, so that their answer may be plain. No answer by a prelate or attorney will then avail, but each will be required to answer for himself.'[2]

With so great an emphasis upon the responsibility of the individual, Wycliffe realized that the individual must know the Word, by which he could become enlightened; thus it became necessary for Wycliffe to translate the Bible into the English language and to send forth preachers who would proclaim it. As significant as Wycliffe's translation was, and as interesting as the problems connected with it might be, we cannot here discuss this aspect of the evangelical doctor's work;[3] our concern lies in Wycliffe's emphasis upon preaching and in

1. Winn, op. cit., p. 6.
2. Wycliffe, Speculum Secularium Dominorum, as quoted by Winn, op. cit., p. 6.
3. For the heated debate over Wycliffe's translation, Cf. Sir Thomas More, "Dialogue;" Francis Adian Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation; Lechler, op. cit., pp. 202-222; Winn, op. cit., pp. 7-8. And especially Miss Deanesly, Lollard Bible as an answer to Gasquet's The Old English Bible.

his sending forth his Poor Priests. Wycliffe held that it is the chief business of a preacher to preach the Word; for to him, the Word of God was "'the Divine Seed, which overpowers strong warriors, softens hard hearts, and renews, and makes divine, men brutalised by sin, and departed infinitely far from God.'"[1] When the gospel was preached by the Apostles, the Church of Christ grew mightily; "'whereas, at the present day,'" said Wycliffe, "'the Church is continually decreasing for the want of this spiritual seed;'" therefore, the priests must learn to teach Holy Scripture, that "'the Church may learn to know the walk of Christ, and may be led to love Christ Himself.'"[2] Condemning those who recited tales and fables rather than preach God's Word, Wycliffe held

> '. . . (th)is manere good: to leeve sich wordis and triste in God, and telle sureli His laws, and speciali His gospellis. For we trowen (th)at (th)ei camen of Crist, and so God sei(th) hem alle.'[3]

Likewise, he condemned another prevailing fashion of breaking the Scripture into the smallest divisions of the scholastic school-room and of covering it with such rhetorical and poetical ornamentation that Wycliffe pronounced the result as dead and not the true word of eternal life. "'Oh! if the Apostle,'" he exclaimed, "'had heard such hair-splitting how he must have despised it.'"[4] To the objection that should the old system of logical divisions and

1. Wycliffe, sermon on Luke VIII. II. as quoted by Lechler, op. cit., p. 178.
2. Ut per Lechler, op. cit., p. 183.
3. Wycliffe, "The Gospel on the Sixte Day after Cristmasse Dai.", as quoted by Winn, op. cit., p. 41.
4. Ut per Workman, op. cit., vol. II, p. 211.

oratory be abandoned, then one could not differentiate between a thoroughly schooled divine and a poorly educated priest, Wycliffe replies that such savours more of personal vainglory than of sincere concern for the Word. To the argument that as theology is the most perfect of all subjects, it should be clothed in the noblest oratory and the most beautiful poetry, Wycliffe replies that such an ornamental style is so little in keeping with God's Word that the latter is rather corrupted by it, and its power paralysed for the conversion and regeneration of souls.[1] Although a learned doctor himself, Wycliffe preferred 'a humble and homely proclamation of the gospel;' he liked a simplicity of language (plana locutio) and a genuine devout feeling (fidelis sermonis ministratio), from which everything in the sermon should be the outcome. "'If the soul is not in tune with the words,'" he asked, "'how can the words have power? If thou hast no love, thou art sounding brass. . . .'" Even sharpness of speech (acuti sermones) must not include in it malice or ill-felling. In proclaiming the gospel, the true teacher, he said, "'must address himself to the heart, so as to flash the light into the spirit of the hearer, and to bend his will into obedience to the truth.'"[2] Wycliffe insisted on "'the naked text,'" or exposition of the Gospel message "'per nudum textum,'" freed of the accumulation of outside foreign matter; from this insistence, says Owst, "can be traced each successive step in the Lollard conception of the pulpit."

1. Lechler, op. cit., pp. 181-182.
2. Wycliffe, as quoted by Lechler, op. cit., passim, pp. 183-184.

Owst continues:

> Though neither his Evangelicalism nor his Puritanism were by any means original . . . this adhesion to the scriptural phrase as ultimate standard of religion itself, revived and maintained the superiority of pulpit evangelism over ceremonial, and with it every element of mediaeval Puritanism which had flourished in the past.[1]

At one time in his life, Wycliffe might have commended the religion of the Franciscans, and stated that they were "very dear to God," but there came a time when he judged them false; "'for (th)ei shapen (th)er sermouns more to gete hem good (th)an to profite to (th)e Chirche.'"[2] Lechler says that the Franciscans and the Dominicans "humoured the corrupt taste of the time, and flavoured their pulpit addresses with such stories and buffooneries" as to amuse the multitude into giving a collection which would send such 'penny-preachers' merrily on their way.[3] With such an exalted concept of the place and purpose of preaching as he had come to have, Wycliffe needed and wanted "an entirely different class of preacher, one who should call people to repentence, and make the sermon the great instrument for reformation of life and manners."[4]

It is difficult to find an exact date when Wycliffe first instituted his itinerant preachers. Likely, while he was still at Oxford, he began to send out young men who had embraced his views; and later when he withdrew to Lutterworth, he continued to direct the activities of his volunteers and enlarged this successful practice. Workman suggests that Wycliffe was sending them out as

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 132-133.
2. Ut per Winn, op. cit., p. 79.
3. Lechler, op. cit., pp. 179-180.
4. Trevelyan, Engl. in Age of Wycliffe, p. 177.

early as the year 1377.[1] Undoubtedly Wycliffe was influenced by the example and ideals of St. Francis, but he returned to the Mission of the Seventy for inspiration and model. Having seen how perverted the ideals of the preaching friars had become, Wycliffe seems to have had no intention or desire to create another Order; yet from his writings, it appears that he had some system in the training and use of his preachers. "'It seems to be a meritorious thing to associate good priests together,'" he said, "'since Christ, the pattern of every good work, did likewise.'"[2] The dread of simony and the fear of misusing poor men's goods, caused Wycliffe to advise his associates against accepting benefices; there was hope of doing more good by itinerant labors than by being limited to one parish. In receiving alms he cautioned them to live worthily and uprightly, for they could not be confirmed without regard to their good behavior; all temporal gifts were to be enjoyed in moderation. Their number, their locality, and the time of their appointments were all to be well considered, "for both excess and deficiency in these points introduce an occasion of error, according to the opinion of discreet men." Speaking of his preachers, Wycliffe said,

> 'let them be given to the duties which befit the priesthood, for want of habitude as well as indolence unfits men for this work; and it is not every occupation, as the keeping of a booth, or hunting, or devotion to games or to chess, which is becoming to a priest, but studious acquaintance with God's law, plain preaching of the word of God, and devout prayerfulness. . . . And if anyone is specially skilled in training priests on this model, he had a power which comes of God, and possesses merit through grace when he accomplishes such a work.'[3]

1. Workman, op. cit., vol. II, p. 201. Cf. Lechler, op. cit., p. 192 ff.
2. Ut per Lewis Sergeant, John Wyclif (London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893), 270.
3. Ibid., passim, pp. 270-271.

In his English tract, Of Good Prechyng Prestis, the pastor of Lutterworth advises his followers to preach God's law, to denounce all sins prevailing among different ranks and the hypocrisy of the Antichrist, to strive to promote true love in all Christendom, and to help men to reach the blessedness of heaven. Charles Tylor says, "the Marching orders which Wycliffe gave to his Gospel Corps were to preach wherever they could find an audience."[1] Wycliffe taught that as Christ preached not only in the synagogues but more often in the towns, so should Christ's followers; for "'it is not the place that sanctifies the people, but the people the place.'" If the local parson were friendly, they might preach from the steps of the altar (as pulpits were rare in those days); if he were hostile to them, then they were to preach in the church-yard or at the markets or in the homes of the people. "'It was ever the manner of Jesus,'" said Wycliffe,

> 'to speak the words of God wherever he knew they might be profitable to those who heard them. Hence Christ often preached, now at meat, now at supper, and indeed at whatever time it was convenient for others to hear him. . . . Let a man so guess of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and as dispensers of his services.'[2]

It seems that at first Wycliffe used only ordained men in his "Preaching Itinerancy," otherwise he would not have applied the name of priest or presbyter to them, as he does in his work on The Pastoral Office.[3] A later development included the use of lay-preaching,

1. Charles Tylor, Tares and Wheat, A Memorial of John Wycliffe (2nd. ed., London: Headley Brothers, 1898), 27.
2. MS. Homilies, British Museum, Bib. Reg. XVIII, 134-169., as quoted by Robert Vaughan, John De Wycliffe, a Monograph (London: Seeleys, 1853), 389.
3. Vide Lechler, op. cit., pp. 189-201 for discussion of the several stages of development.

"as it had been practised before among the Waldenses . . . ; and yet," says Lechler, "so far at least as I know the writings of Wycliffe, he was not at all aware of this precedent, and acted quite independently of it."[1] There is no question of lay-preachers among the Lollards after Wycliffe's death; but Workman and Lechler, upon whom we lean heavily in our discussion, differ as to their appearance within Wycliffe's lifetime. Lechler holds the opinion that "even in his lifetime, and with his knowledge and approval, laymen were employed as itinerant preachers."[2] Workman, on the other hand, says: "we believe that this was not so, though no doubt towards the close Wyclif was drifting in that direction."[3] Workman cites the silence of Wycliffe's enemies as sufficient proof that there were no laymen among the itinerant preachers. William Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his edict against them, May, 1382, had only condemned "'certain unauthorised itinerant preachers'" who preached erroneous and heretical assertions "'without having obtained any episcopal or papal authorisation.'"[4] While he was still at Oxford, most of Wycliffe's followers were men of culture and education; later the majority were simple, unlettered clerks who lacking licence to preach were, nevertheless, ordained priests.[5] To prove his opinion, Lechler cites the change from Wycliffe's early references to his beloved itinerants as "poor priests" or "simple and faithful priests" to his later references to them as "evangelical men" or "apostolic men;"

1. Lechler, op. cit., p. 195.
2. Ibid.
3. Workman, op. cit., vol. II, p. 202.
4. Vide Wilkins' Concilia Magnae Britanniae, III, fol. 158.
5. Workman, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 202-203.

of which Lechler writes: "it looks as if . . . he intentionally avoided the name of priests, because this was now no longer applicable to all the itinerants."[1] In his Speculum Ecclesiae Militantis, Wycliffe seems to favor the unlearned preacher to many of the graduates of the colleges, "'because the former scatters the seed of the law of Christ more humbly and more abundantly both in deed and in word.'"[2] For "the most convincing passage" in behalf of his view that Wycliffe used lay-preachers, Lechler refers to one of Wycliffe's later Latin sermons, in which Wycliffe

> asserts with great emphasis that for a ministry in the Church the Divine call and commission are perfectly sufficient; there is an installation by God Himself, although the bishop has given in such a case no imposition of hands, in accordance with his traditions.[3]

Noting that Wycliffe tended more and more to hold that the licence of Christ was sufficient authority for the right to preach, Winn suggests how Wycliffe arrived at this conclusion:

> In medieval church theory the main function of a bishop was to preach himself, and to license auxiliary preachers. The bishops of Wyclif's day failed to do this sufficiently for the adequate promulgation of the Gospel. Wyclif therefore declared that if the bishops fell short of grace, in this respect, recourse must be had direct to the chief bishop, namely, Christ, who of Himself would grant the necessary power and authority. This typically scholastic line of thought is well illustrated by the following sentence from (Th)e Pater Noster: 'Praye we Jesus Crist, byschepe of oure soule, (th)at he ordeyne prechours in (th)e peple to warne hem of synne and telle hem (th)e tru(th)e of God.'[4]

1. Lechler, op. cit., pp. 195-196.
2. Wycliffe, as quoted by Lechler, op. cit., p. 196.
3. Lechler, op. cit., p. 196. Wycliffe's own words are: 'Videtur ergo, quod ad esse talis ministerii ecclesiae requiritur auctoritas acceptationis divinae, et per consequens potestas ac notitia data a Deo ad tale ministerium peragendum, quibus habitis, licet episcopus secundum traditiones suas non imposuit illi manus, Deus per se instituit.' Sermons for Saints Days, No. 8, fol. 17, col. 1.
4. Winn, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

His views on ordination and apostolic succession became more and more heretical. To him the real worth of a man was not dependent upon his position in the church. "'For crown and cloth make no priest, nor the emperor's bishop with his words, but power that Christ giveth, and thus by life are priests known.'"[1]

Whether they were all ordained or not, and surely without the bishop's licence, these men went forth, barefooted and dressed in long garments of coarse red woolen cloth, symbolic of their toil and poverty. They carried a staff in hand, "in order to represent themselves as pilgrims, and their wayfaring as a kind of pilgrimage."[2] According to Tylor, there were, at one time after Wycliffe's death, "about two hundred of these itinerant preachers"[3] who wandered from place to place, faithfully "'scattering the seed of God's Word.'" Possessing only a few pages of Wycliffe's translation of the Gospels, some of his religious tracts and sermon-notes[4] written especially for them, these earnest evangelists preached, in simple and plain language, the need of repentance. As the Leicester Chronciler tells us,

> they were continually enforcing that 'no man could become righteous and well-pleasing to God who did not hold to Goddis law,' for that, says he, 'was their appealing in all their addresses.'[5]

1. Wycliffe, as quoted by Trevelyan, Wycliffe, etc., p. 180.
2. Lechler, op. cit., pp. 196-197.
3. Tylor, op. cit., p. 25.
4. Vide Lechler, op. cit., pp. 199-201. At the end of one of his sermons occurs this remark: 'In this Gospel may priests tell of false pride of rich men, and of lustful life of mighty men of this world, and of long pains of hell, and joyful bliss in heaven, and thus lengthen their sermon as the time asketh.' (p. 200).
5. As quoted by Lechler, op. cit., p. 197.

As Lechler says, they must have spoken in a plain and simple language which both attracted and subdued their hearers; their descriptions were emphatic and keen. If they were bold in depicting the prevailing sins of their time, they were also earnest in laboring for "the awakening and moral regeneration of the people, setting eternity before their eyes, and exhorting them to live in Christian brotherhood and peace and beneficence."[1] Like the friars before them, Wycliffe's preachers soon became, as Workman describes them, "a power in the land;" their influence is "evident from the panic-stricken exaggeration of the chroniclers that 'they went over all England seducing nobles and great lords,' and that in consequence in Leicester 'every second man you met was a lollard.'"[2]

Wycliffe had begun "'to determine matters upon the sacrament of the Altar'" as early as 1379; and, in Rashdall's words, "his determination amounted to a categorical and peremptory denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation."[3] In his condemnation of the sins among the clergy of his time, Wycliffe had the support of many clergymen; in his hostility to the Pope, he was backed by many nobles; but when he denied this central doctrine of the Medieval Church, he alienated his most influential friends and was left practically alone to face his determined oponents. Of the significance of this doctrine, Rashdall says:

> Wycliffe's new heresy sealed his doom in the eyes of the mediaeval church. For those who conceded least to the claims of the priesthood admitted that priests and priests alone could

1. Lechler, op. cit., p. 198.
2. Workman, op. cit., vol. II, p. 204.
3. Rashdall, op. cit., p. 212.

> 'make the body of Christ.' If they could not do that, the lay world would inevitably draw inferences which would be fatal to the whole system of hierarchical pretension.[1]

In 1380, Wycliffe was condemned as a heretic by a committee of twelve Oxford doctors; he replied in a Latin Confessio, but he was forced to leave Oxford for ever. He left many friends there, but one by one they would be broken into submission or driven from the University. The tragic Peasants' Rising came in 1381 which brought more sorrow and suspicion upon Wycliffe and his followers. In 1382 the new archbishop called a court or council to deal with the new heresy, at which time occurred an earthquake which prompted some to suggest that after such an omen the proceedings should be abandoned; but Courtenay replied that "as the earth was purging itself of its foul winds, so the kingdom would be purged, though not without great trouble and agitation, of the heresies which afflicted it."[2] Among the propositions condemned by this "earthquake council" was this one: "To assert that it is lawful for any one -- even a deacon or priest -- to preach the word of God without licence of the apostolic see or of a catholic bishop or any other sufficiently recognised authority."[3] The hierachical plan of attack seemed to have been to destroy Wycliffe's following before they directly attacked his person. Repingdon of Oxford was forced to recant; Hereford fled. The liberties of the University were suppressed and silenced. Trevelyan says:

> This purge, which had to be repeated in the reign of Henry IV, cut off Lollardry from its roots in the best culture of the day, and helped to turn it into a popular evangelicalism, hiding

1. Rashdall, op. cit., p. 212.
2. Ibid., p. 213.
3. Ibid., p. 214.

> from authority and propagating itself among the poor. Courtenay's suppression of the liberty of academic thought doomed the University to a hundred years of intellectual stagnation. . . . No single act had more to do with the barrenness of English mental and spiritual life in the Fifteenth Century.[1]

Yet Wycliffe was left unmolested at Lutterworth, from which he blasted forth against Bishop Spenser's miserable crusade and where about the same time he became paralysed, in which state he lived for two years before his death in 1384. The Wycliffites had contained an inner circle of enthusiastic and able men — such as John Aston, John Purvey, John Parker, William Swinderby, William Smith, and Richard Waytstathe — and an outer circle, comprised of men and women of all classes, who listened and read, learned and often believed, many of whom became themselves "the teachers of others." So numerous became Wycliffe's followers during the period between his death and the close of the century that, according to the testimony of opponents, at least half the population had ranged themselves on their side.[2] Many times knights stood "'at the preacher's side, armed with sword and shield, ready to protect him should any one dare to oppose in any way his person or his doctrine.'"[3] Nevertheless, one by one Wycliffe's prominent supporters were broken and discredited.[4]

In 1400 was passed the infamous Act de haeretico comburendo, by which the bishops were empowered to arrest, imprison, and to hand over to the civil officers the persistent or relapsed heretics, 'to be

1. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 249.
2. Lechler, op. cit., p. 440.
3. Knighton, as quoted by Lechler, op. cit., p. 444.
4. Vide James Gairdner, Lollardy and the Reformation in England, (4 vols., London: Macmillan & Co., 1908), I, 21-98. Lechler, op. cit., pp. 445-460. Workman, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 325-404.

by them burned on a high place before the people.' William Sawtree was the first of the Wycliffite martyrs; John Badby, a simple tailor, was the next victim of the new Inquisition. Once the fires of persecution were lit, they would burn bright and long before they would be put out. Many who did not perish in the flames were committed to perpetual imprisonment. Such seems to have been the fate of William Thorpe who answered well as a disciple of Wycliffe and who, through Foxe's Acts and Monuments, cast his shadow onto Bunyan and others who centuries later were called before the authorities for "unauthorized" preaching. To the Archbishop's taunt "'You presume, that the Lord hath chosen you only for to preach, as faithfull disciples and speciall followers of Christ,'" -- Thorpe replied:

> 'Sir, . . . We presume not here of our selues for to be esteemed . . . faithful dysciples, and speciall followers of Christ. But Sir, as I said to you before, we deeme this, by authoritie chiefly of Gods word, that it is the chiefe dutie of everie priest, to busie them faithfullie to make the law of God knowne to his people, and so to commune the commandment of God charitablie, how that we may best, where, when, and to whom that ever we may, is our verie dutie. . . .
>
> Archbishop: 'Lewd losel! whereto makest thou such vaine reason to me? Asketh not Saint Paule, How should priestes preach, except they be sent? But I sent thee never to preach; for thy venemous doctrine is so knowne throughout England, that no bishop will admit thee to preach by witnessing of their letters. Why then, lewd idiot! wilt thou presume to preach, since thou art not sent, nor licensed of thy soveroign to preach? . . .
>
> Thorpe: '. . . since in this matter your termes be some too large, and some too strait, we dare not oblige us thus to bee bounden to you for to keepe the termes, which you wil limit to us, as you doe to friers and such other preachers; and therefore, though we have not your letter Sir, nor letters of anie other bishops written with inke vpon parchment, we dare not therefore leaue the office of preaching (to which preaching, all priests, after their cunning and power, are bounden by diuers testimonies of Gods lawe, and great doctors) without anie mention making of bishoppes letters. . . . he that commandeth us to doe the office of priesthood, he will be our sufficient letters and witnesse, if we, by example of his holie living and teaching, speciallie occupie vs faithfullie to do our office instlie: Yea the people

to whom we preach . . . shall be our letters, that is, our witnes bearers, that the truth and soothfastnesse which they heard and did after, is cause of their saluation. . . . We need no letters of commendations, as some preachers do, which preach for couetousness of temporall goods, and for mens praising. . . .

. . . . . .

Archbishop: 'All these alledginges that thou bringest forth are not else but proud presumptuousnesse; for hereby thou inforcest thee to prove, that thou and such others are so inst, that ye ought not to obeie to prelates. And thus, against the learning of Saint Paule that teacheth you not to preach but if ye were sent, of your owne authoritie ye will go forth and preach, and doe what ye list.

. . . . . .

Thorpe: 'Sir, as the tenth chapter of Matthew, and the last chapter of Mark witnesseth, Christ sent his apostles for to preach. And the tenth chapter of Luke witnesseth, that Christ sent his two and seuentie disciples for to preach, in euerie place that Christ was to come to: and S. Gregorie, in the common lawe, saith, that euerie man that goeth to priesthood, taketh vpon him the office of preaching: for, as he saith, that priest stirreth God to great wrath, of whose mouth is not heard the voice of preaching; and, as other more gloses vpon Ezechiel witnesse, that the priest that preacheth not busilie to the people, shall be partaker of their damnation that perish through his default. . . . Wherefore Sir, these authorities and other well considered, I deeme my selfe damnable, if I, either for pleasure or displeasure of any creature, applie mee not diligentlie to preach the word of God.

And the Archbishop said to those three clearks that stoode before him: 'Loe Sire, this is the maner and businesse of this losell and such other, to picke out such sharpe sentences of holy Scripture and doctors, to maintaine their sect and lore against the ordinance of holy Church. And therefore, losell! it is thou that covetest to haue again the Psalter that I made to bee taken from thee at Canturburie, to record sharpe verses against vs. But thou shalt neuer haue that Psalter, nor none other booke, till that I know that thy hart and thy mouth accord fullie, to be governed by holy church.'[1]

It is doubtful that Thorpe ever got his Psalter back, for Foxe tells us that there is no word that he ever recanted or retracted even a sentence; as there is no record of his being burned, Foxe concludes

1. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, ed. Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley (London: R. B. Seeley & W. Burnside, 1837), vol. III, Bk. V, 260-262. Vide pp. 249-285. As the relevancy of these words will become obvious when we come to discuss the trials and debates over unlicensed preachers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I trust that this long quotation will be excused.

that he was either "secretly made away with" or died in prison. Not only were Psalters taken from the people, but in 1410 all of Wycliffe's works were condemned and burned at Oxford; and in 1428 Wycliffe's bones were dug up, burned and cast into the Swift which, in Fuller's famous words:

> . . . conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they into the main ocean. And thus the Ashes of Wickliffe are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the World over.[1]

But the Word remained in England; Wycliffe's Bible, despite all efforts to destroy it,[2] remained like seed buried in the earth. Under the shadows of night it would be passed from hand to hand and read in secret places. In barns and caves, in open-fields and homes, groups would gather to hear the Word; on such occasions many like William Smith of Leicester would learn to read the Scriptures for themselves. Knighton complained that the Word had become more accessible and familiar "'to laymen and to women than it had heretofore been to the most intelligent and learned of the clergy.'"[3] The liberty, which Wycliffe had given to the deacons and unbeneficed priest to preach without bishop's licence, was taken by laymen — if Wycliffe himself had not extended it to them. As early as the late

1. Thomas Fuller, Church History of Britain (3rd ed., 3 vols., London: Printed for Thomas Tegg, 1842), I, Bk. IV, pars. 52-54, 493.

2. No less than one hundred and fifty manuscripts have survived, although little else of Wycliffe's writings were to remain in England; what we know of these other works has come from manuscripts found on the continent, chiefly in Vienna. Vide Lechler, op. cit., p. 444, footnote 2. Also Forshall and Madden's Wycliffite Versions.

3. Lechler, op. cit., p. 445.

fourteenth century we hear of these lay evangelists:

> 'Behold now we see so great a scattering of the Gospel, that simple men and women, and those accounted ignorant laymen (laici ydiote) in the reputation of men, write and study the Gospel, and, as far as they can and know how, teach and scatter the Word of God. But whether God would appoint such, as the world grows old, to confound the pride of the worldly-wise, I know not. God knoweth!'[1]

Owst refers to Walter Hilton, Canon of Thurgarton, and his tirade against boasting and pride as supplying a quaint illustration of Pecock's comment upon the ignorant preachers, which, says Owst, "had it not been for a marginal note, we might hardly have identified with the followers of Wycliffe at all. In its light we seem to be looking at the notorious preaching laymen of Bunyan's day . . ."[2] To secure their questionable throne, Henry IV and Henry V might lend an arm to the Church's effort to destroy such unlawful "conventicles" but "Lollardry survived underground in the towns and villages of England." Trevelyan continues:

> In the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII the recrudescence of this native heresy began to alarm the orthodox and to provoke a very active persecution, marked by many martyrdoms, before it became merged in the return wave of Protestantism from Luther's Germany. But every important aspect of the English Reformation was of native origin. All can be traced back as far as Wycliffe, and some much farther.[3]

"The wandering star,"[4] as Owst describes the mystical hermits and other irregular preachers of the Middle Ages, constitute a third aspect of our medieval inheritance. Blessed by no official authority,

1. As quoted by Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 135. Vide MS. Camb. Univ. Libr. Ii, iii, 8, fol. 149.
2. Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 138-139.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 250.
4. Owst, Preaching etc., p. 106.

they came forth unwanted and passed almost unremembered — those "wild, restless spirits whose vision shifts and fades in an impatient age."[1] As a result of the pestilences, famines, storms and comets, the foreign wars, internal risings, great social wrongs and incompetent government and the equally disastrous corruption and decay in the Church which characterized the fifteenth century, the highly sensitive man of religion was apt to become "introspective, moody, isolated" and " inevitably unbalanced, like the over-wrought prophet of Israel." Under the spell of such a crisis as this, continues Owst, "little wonder that the most timid and orthodox Churchmen have flung every ordinance, every recognized means of grace to the winds, and dared to speak direct to the Almighty upon his mountain."[2] From their Sinai or Mount of Transfiguration such men would go forth to proclaim their message. Men of the type of Peter the Hermit and Richard Rolle came also in the fifteenth century as hermit-missionaries who alternated from meditating long hours in their cells to wandering about preaching and counseling.[3] Along with such men of sincere devotion and heroic self-sacrifice, came mere mad men and villains to exploit the emotions and fears of the people. "They have but one vague feature in common, these pardoners, heretics and 'Gyrovagi' -- who call themselves hermits," says Owst, "and that feature is their abnormality, their 'extravagance.'"[4] To the writer

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 96.
2. Ibid., pp. 98-99
3. Vide Francis D. S. Darwin, The English Mediaeval Recluse (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, n.d.), 3. Also R. M. Clay, The Hermits.
4. Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 97.

of Bishop Grandisson's Register, they were the woeful heralds of Anti-Christ.[1] These irregular preachers often created disturbances and conflicts. Sometimes there was

> nothing less than a most unedifying scramble for possession of the parish pulpit itself. John Heywood's scandalous interlude in which a pardoner and a friar each struggle for the privilege of addressing one and the same audience, and come to blows within the sacred edifice, is surely no mere dramatic invention.[2]

Owst speaks of the careful and repeated warnings in the preaching-licenses as indicative of the problems which these men caused. Although we know little about them, yet their number and influence were "an undoubted sign of the times, and the call of men's hearts."[3] Along with the Lollard heretic, these irregulars defied the fundamental notion of 'prelatio et cura animarum' and brought forth a host of episcopal mandates which sought to control all preaching.[4]

The effort of the church to limit and control preaching constitutes the last aspect of our medieval inheritance which we shall discuss as being relevant to our study of lay-preaching. In one of the many little hand-books of Canon Law and instruction furnished for the clergy, the Regimen Animarum, the question is asked: "who can lawfully preach?" Owst says that the first choice goes to the bishop and the parson who have the authoritative charge of souls;

> The rest of that vast preaching host of the later Middle Ages, monks and Mendicants, University graduates in theology, vicars, chaplains, pardoners and recluses, even the Templar

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 97.
2. Ibid., p. 106.
3. Ibid., p. 97. Vide Darwin, op. cit., p. 19.
4. Ibid., pp. 140-142.

> and Hospitaller and the rest are but auxilliaries, to be admitted to the ranks of sacred heraldry only by special privilege, and further license by their own prelati, and those of the places where they might preach.[1]

To the question, "Can laymen preach?", the answer of Summa Angelica is, "Certainly not" — "nec publice, nec private;" for such would be a mortal sin.[2] Owst quotes this advice from a Fifteenth Century tract on the Decalogue:

> 'Yf thou be a prest, and havest kunnynge and auctoryte, preche and teche Godes worde to his peple; and yf thou be no prest nother clerk, but on of the peple, thenne bysy the in the holyday to here preachynge of Godes worde, and be aboute with thy goede spekynge and styrynge to brynge thy neyzebores to betere lyvynge.'[3]

John Walton, in his Sepeculum Christiani, distinguishes the duties of the clergy and of the laity in these words:

> 'Prechynge es in a place where es clepynge to gedyr, or folvynge of pepyl in holy dayes, in chyrches or othe certeyn places and tymes ordeyned ther to. And it longeth to hem th^{t} been ordeyned ther to, the whyche have iurediccion and auctorite, and to noon othyr. Techynge es th^{t} eche body may enforme and teche hys brothyr in every place and in conable tyme, es he seeth th^{t} it be spedful: ffor this es a godly almes dede to whych every man es bounde th^{t} hath cunnynge.'[4]

As for women preaching, the Dominican Humbertus de Romanis says they must be excluded from the pulpits,

> first because they lacked sufficient intelligence, secondly because an inferior role in life has been given them by God, thirdly because in such a position they would provoke immorality; fourthly, owing to the folly of the first woman, Eve, who as St. Bernard pointed out, by opening her mouth on a certain occasion, brought ruin to the whole world.[5]

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 1.
2. Vide Owst's reference to Summa Angelica, under 'Predicare,' MS. Harl. 2272. fol. 9. in Preaching, etc., p. 4.
3. MS. Harl. 2398, as quoted by Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 4.
4. John Walton, Sepeculum Christiani, as quoted by Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 4.
5. Owst, Preaching, etc., p. 5.

The Medieval world had three Orders or estates: the clergy, the knights and the laborer. In one of these three categories all men were to find their place, their calling, their duties and privileges. God has ordained three classes of men, wrote a Dominican of the fourteenth century,

> 'namely, labourers such as husbandmen and craftsmen to support the whole body of the church after the manner of feet, knights to defend it in the fashion of hands, clergy to rule and lead it after the manner of eyes. And all the aforesaid who maintain their own status are of the family of God. . . .'[1]

Each man, be he knight or priest, workman or merchant, was "to learn and labour truly in the things of his own particular calling, resting content therewith and not aspiring to meddle with the tasks and mysteries of others;" his social rank was ordained by God and was intended to remain fixed and immutable. The command of St. Paul — "Let each man abide in the same calling wherein he was called" — was used as the basis of this doctrine of social distinctions and as a barrier to any one who wanted to advance or to change his status.[2] As long as each man remained in his place, there was harmony in society; but when one "'who is unworthy in respect of manners, knowledge and wisdom is set in high position through favour, bribery or inordinate love,'" then "'. . . the string [is] out of its place which destroys the whole melody.'"[3]

All irregular preaching was a discord to the Church's harmony, and there were many attempts to correct these disturbances. In 1387, the Bishop of Worcester issued a mandate that "ne Lollardi predicent

1. As quoted by Owst, Literature and Pulpit, p. 554.
2. Owst, Literature and Pulpit, pp. 557-558. Also pp. 314, 353, 370.
3. As quoted by Owst, Literature and Pulpit, p. 558.

infra suam diocesium" — whether openly in churches, or church-yards, streets, or other secular places, or secretly in halls, chambers, gardens or closes; but somehow the "dischord" remained. In 1409, Archbishop Arundel published an outstanding measure which sought to bring all preaching under control. There were three main provisions of this regulation: (1) a rigid tightening up of the system of license, by which no secular or regular might venture to preach under any circumstance without prior examination by diocesans, and the subsequent issue of letters of authority; (2) a confining of the parish clergy to simple topics of the lay-folk's faith as outlined by the Peckham Decrees, by which the more aggressive and speculative spirits were checked as well as the neglectful and careless ones rebuked for not preaching, the omission of which was given as the cause of the rise and growth of heresy; (3) a restricting of attacks on clerical vices to audiences of clergy and of lay vices to laymen and a confining of doctrine to the limits of discussion prescribed by the church.[1] To Gascoigne, this regulation was "a cruel death-blow to English preaching;" Owst says that it accounts for the decline which followed, for the lazy prelate now had an excuse and the able spokesman might well keep silent for fear of violating the new restrictions.

> Thus the last hope of this particular ministry, its art, its flavour of originality in thought and presentation, its fearless ventilation of public and private sins was doomed. . . . a virile pulpit cries out for freedom, for the right of a man to declare the vision that God had given him in His own way, provided he first gives full consideration to the

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 140-142.

> claims of his church and of other people. Now, however, if popular rumour carried the news of some too outspoken address to the ears of the bishop of his officers, there would be a Henry Wynnegode, some official-Peculiar, at the offender's heels. . . . Who could afford to preach, without thinking twice, and more, in such circumstances? Sic transit gloria pulpiti![1]

Despite these laws and persecutions, "the spiritual ancestors of John Bunyan"[2] — the peasants in the Chilterns, the apprentices in London, the craftsmen in Bristol — gathered secretly to read the Wycliffite epistles and gospels and to exhort each other to be faithful to the teachings they found there. Dargan, in his History of Preaching, says,

> this Lollard influence not only disposed the people to desire and hear gladly the evangelical preaching, but also was of force in forming the preachers themselves.[3]

When the war of Roses was finally exhausted, the Tudors were confronted with a revival of Wycliffe's teachings. Separated from the wealthier and educated classes, the followers of Wycliffe had become indeed "simple men;" the very name by which they were now generally known, Lollard, suggests the whining or humming speech of an ignorant type of religious enthusiast or fanatic.[4] Nevertheless,

1. Owst, Preaching, etc., pp. 140-142.
2. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 289.
3. Dargan, History of Preaching, vol. I, p. 47. Also vide W. H. Beckett, English Reformation of Sixteenth Century.
4. Vide Lechler, op. cit., pp. 439-440. Also Sergeant, op. cit., pp. 269-270 for discussion of origin of the name. It was used in Wycliffe's lifetime, but came into general use only after his death. Some assign its origin to a Walter Lollard of the Netherlands; others to the Latin word lolium, meaning "tares" (as suggests Chaucer); others to the old English word "loller," meaning a loafer (Vision of Piers Plowman); Lechler seems to favor its derivation from the old German lollen, lullen, 'to hum or whine' which was used to satirize the preaching of the fourteenth-century ante-type of the modern revivalist or Salvation Army preacher.

they were heard, and by them men and women were brought to a personal knowledge of Christ, as is evidenced by the confession of a Lollard preacher in 1518 that he had converted seven hundred persons in the course of his life.[1]

In a concluding paragraph, let us recapitulate the main elements of this chapter. In looking back upon our medieval inheritance, we have noted how the preaching friars came to England, as simple men preaching Christ in the language of the people at the market-cross or wherever men gathered, and thus created a demand for preaching. In a hurried study of Wycliffe, we have noted his appeal to the Scriptures and his institution of poor preachers, which came to include laymen, who spoke in the plain language of the streets. We have referred to the irregular preachers of the Middle Ages and the alarm which they and the Lollard heretics caused the Church and the ensuing rules and regulations which stifled all preaching, separated criticism of contemporary evils from the Church and forced it into what became a lay-revolt. We have not claimed all these as laymen; only the late Lollards and some of the irregulars were laymen. Yet the compassion and devotion of the early preaching friars was not totally different from that of some of the sixteenth and seventeenth century lay-preachers; the clashes between the friars and the regular clergy were to be repeated in different circumstances; and when during the Commonwealth there were to be disturbances in the church service and even struggles over the pulpit, we need to remember

1. Trevelyan, Engl. in the Age of Wycliffe, p. 348.

that such was not new. When Elizabeth and James I and Charles I sought to suppress all irregular preaching and to confine it to certain topics and persons, we need to recall the efforts of the medieval church to do the same thing. When the "tub-preachers" were scorned and reminded of their place, the same language was to be used and the same scripture cited against their usurpation as was used in the Middle Ages to safe-guard the harmony of society. As Chaucer himself said:

'Ther n'is no newé guise that it n'as old.'[1]

1. Ut per Trevelyan, Engl. Soc. Hist., p. 47.

CHAPTER TWO

LAY-PREACHING IN THE REFORMATION (1500-1553)

INTRODUCTION

I. SURVIVAL OF THE LOLLARD PREACHER
   - A. "Readers" in Bible-clusters
   - B. Confessions of these teachers
   - C. Religious and social changes

II. THE "OXFORD REFORMERS" OF THE NEW LEARNING
   - A. John Colet's preaching
   - B. Erasmus' writings
   - C. Thomas More's activities

III. PREPARATION FOR THE REFORMATION
   - A. Wolsey's gestures of reformation
   - B. Luther and Erasmus
   - C. Tyndale's development
   - D. Opposition to English Bible

IV. LAY-TEACHERS OF THE NEW LEARNING
   - A. Tyndalian "Bible groups"
   - B. Confessions of "readers"
   - C. Expectations

V. THE BREAK WITH ROME
   - A. The abolition of Papal authority
   - B. The victory of the English Bible

VI. CHECKING THE REFORMATION
   - A. The Six Articles Act
   - B. Public Bible-readers restricted
   - C. Restrictions placed on use of Bible
   - D. Efforts to enforce uniformity

VII. THE EDWARDIAN REFORMATION
   - A. Resumption of Reformation
   - B. Efforts to check disorders
   - C. Anglican uniformity
   - D. Faults and failures of clergy
   - E. "Semi-Anabaptist" preachers
   - F. The desire for further reformation

There is no day, no month nor year of which we can say: at that time the Middle Ages ended. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 is often used as a convenient date, but history cannot be so simply divided; even the general consent of historians to place the close of the Middle Ages at the end of the fifteenth century is "arbitrary and conventional, and suggests a sudden transformation remote from reality."[1] Medieval conditions gradually faded as men and events called for new ways of life; yet those forces which shaped the modern age were causing men of the mid-sixteenth century to say, The world is changing. With the development of nationalism, the opening of new trade-routes and the discovery of America, the rise of capitalism, the religious awakening and disruption, the beginning of critical induction and scientific investigation — the individual became conscious of increased importance and began to criticize those institutions which he previously had accepted. Modern history, says Bishop Creighton in the Cambridge Modern History, "begins with a struggle for liberty on the ground which was the largest, the right of free self-realisation as towards God";[2] while the issue began with a criticism of the Church, it rapidly developed to change the whole social pattern. Other factors combined in producing a new spirit within the people: the villeins demanded more freedom and crowded

1. The Cambridge Medieval History, ed. C. W. Previté-Orton and Z. N. Brooke (8 vols., Cambridge: University Press, 1936), VIII, 803.

2. Cambridge Modern History, ed. A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes (Cambridge: University Press, 1902), I, 2-3.

into the towns where the new cloth-trade was creating a prosperous middle class; London was growing in importance, and the way was being prepared for the House of Commons to assume its place as the democratic agent of the people; secondary schools were being founded by municipal guilds and individual burghers so that the son of a butcher could rise to become the first minister of the land and the son of a glover could become the world's greatest dramatist. It was a day of great opportunity; there were new worlds to conquer and great things to do. The rediscovery of Greek and Roman classicism would result in "a new learning" which would raise questions about the old order, and the printing-press would put the Bible into the hands of the people thereby reducing the power of priesthood and encouraging the laymen to think out their own doubts and to seek God after their own consciences. Such changes, both spiritual and material, would unite "to dissolve the fabric of mediaeval society in England."[1]

At the beginning of the sixteenth century one could meet, on the narrow streets and muddy roads of England, men and women on whose cheek was branded the letter "L" or "H"; others could be seen wearing a faggot about their neck or its likeness painted or sewed upon their sleeve — these were the Lollard heretics who, by abjuring Wycliffe's teachings, had escaped imprisonment in the Lollard Tower at St. Paul's or death in the fires at Smithfield. Heresy and Lollardry had become synonymous, for at the center of nearly all the heresy trials was

1. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 268. Vide Ibid., p. 298; also Trevelyan, Engl. Soc. Hist., pp. 74-75.

found a little book or a few leaves of Wycliffe's translated Scriptures, around which a group had gathered and out of which someone had expounded or preached. It is difficult for us to learn much of these fugitive preachers, but from the records of their persecutions and forced confessions we can catch glimpses of men whose main features resemble the Lollard of the past and forecast much of the lay-preacher of the future. Their number can never be ascertained, as most of them pass through the pages of history, hidden and unknown; but, as Anderson says; whatever opinions they expressed, "they were indigenous to this country, and are mainly to be ascribed to certain portions of the Sacred Writings in English manuscript."[1] The Bible was held in the highest esteem among them; in his "Dialogue," Sir Thomas More has a Lollard spokesman say: 'Man has no light but of Holy Scripture'; its interpretation was not to be limited to a specially educated clergy but was revealed to all 'known men', as they called themselves.[2] If they had anything of a church organization, we do not know of it; yet there was a category of "reader" or "teacher" and "learner" or "follower". It appears that these groups were informal ones which clustered around a portion of scripture to hear it read and taught. For the lack of a better name, we might refer to these groups as "Bible-clusters"; and to distinguish them from those which gathered around Tyndale's printed Testament, we might speak of these early ones as "Lollard Bible-clusters."

1. Christopher Anderson, The Annals of the English Bible (2 vols., London: William Pickering, 1845), I, 175.

2. James Gairdner, The English Church, In the Sixteenth Century From the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1904), 59-60.

The leaders of these clusters were themselves simple men, yet they read the Word and preached what they understood of it. Such were James Brewster and William Sweeting, who, in 1505, were accused of having met with a little company in the fields to read "'out of a certain little book . . . of an old writing almost worn for age, whose name is not there expressed'"; both were condemned for having spoken to the people against pilgrimages, offering to images and the sacrament of the altar. Upon their abjuring, they were ordered to bear a faggot all their life. Later when a field laborer in the Earl of Oxford's service, the faggot was removed from Brewster by the earl's controller; likewise with Sweeting, as holy water clerk to the parson of Colchester, the faggot was laid aside. Both were burned together in Smithfield in 1511.[1] The young Henry had been already on his throne for two years; he, who took pride in his knowledge of theology, was anxious to prove his love for the church by burning heretics.

Persecutions continued through 1511 under Warham of Canterbury and Smith of Lincoln; the years 1509 to 1517 were severe under Fitzjames of London, and 1521 was perhaps the cruelest under Longland of Lincoln — but it is from the records of the persecutions in 1527 that we can learn most of these unauthorized teachers. As their confessions were taken after the entry of Tyndale's translation into England in 1526, we must endeavor to cull what was pre-Tyndalian out of their testimony. In 1527 during the visitation of Jeffrey Wharton which was undertaken on behalf of Bishop Tonstall of London,

1. Gairdner, English Church, pp. 53-54.

one Hacker was discovered to have been "a great reader and teacher about six years past in London;" we are told that he was "so hard set upon" that he revealed the names and activities of many of his friends and followers.[1] They were tailors, weavers, husbandmen, saddlers, bricklayers, tallow-chandlers, or of the families of such; they had gathered at different homes to hear the reading of the Epistles of Paul, the Gospels or the Epistle of James; they called themselves "known men or women", meaning they were known to God as His own; they often spoke of themselves as "brothren in Christ."[2] Christopher Ravens was a pre-Tyndalian member, because he had abjured in 1511, and we might suspect the same of those who possessed fragments of Scripture or who were described as "well learned" or "a reader and teacher." Hacker confessed that Mother Beckwyth and her three sons "were learned, before he companied with them;" Mother Bristow had "the Evangelist S. Luke in English;" Henry Tuck was "well learned in his opinions;" William Rayland was "a reader and teacher of his opinions and had a book of the Apocalypse in English."[3]

> Thomas Philip, pointmaker, dwelling against the Little Conduit in Cheap, was of Hacker's sect, and a chief reader and teacher of his opinions. The said Hacker confessed, that he and the said Philip, by the space of five or six years, met oftentimes at Russel's house, and once a quarter in his own house; and there had communications of such opinions as he used: and that Philip did sometime read in a book of Paul, and sometime in a book of the Epistles.[4]

1. John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials (7 vols. London: printed for Samuel Bagster, 1816), I, 115.
2. Ibid., pp. 125, 129. Vide pp. 114-137.
3. Ibid., pp. 116-119, passim.
4. Ibid., p. 118.

One of the men of whom Hacker had spoken, John Pykas, a baker of about thirty-three years, was a chief leader and teacher himself; in his confession, signed March 7, 1527, he tells that "'about a five yeres last past'" his mother sent for him and gave him

> 'one book of Pawles Epistoles in English and byd hym lyve after the maner and way of the said Epistoles and Gospels, and not after the way that the church doth teche. . . .'[1]

Pykas named the houses where he "'at sondry tymes'" had "'tawght, rehersed and affirmed'" against the sacrament of baptism, the confession of sins to a priest, fasting and holy days, pardons granted by the pope or other men.[2] Pykas testified that Robert Best "had knowledge of the Epistle of James, and could say it by heart" and that for "the space of a twelvemonth last past" he had been taken as "a known man, and a border in Christ, amongst them that be called brothren in Christ, and known men."[3] Pykas said that he and John Girlyng had known each other for the last two or three years and that they had communed together upon such passages as the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew which they understood to foretell the overthrow of the priests and a chapter of James which they interpreted as teaching that we should pray only to God as He is the Father of light and overshadows all sin. The members of these secret societies were known to each other and expected such similarities of faith and conduct as "none of the known men did ever set up light before any images" and that they "should pray only to God and no saints."[4]

1. Strype, Memorials, vol. I, p. 123.
2. Ibid., pp. 123-124.
3. Ibid., p. 129.
4. Ibid., pp. 130, 132.

In the trial of William Rayland, it was discovered that he too was a leader, and like Hacker and Pykas, he was forced to betray friends and relatives; something of the same story of these "known men and women" appears in his confession.[1]

Sometimes the cases of the "heretics" were complicated by factors other than religious nonconformity; in 1514 Richard Hunne appealed to the king's court when he became involved in an argument with a priest over a burial sheet; later when he was found dead in the Lollard tower, foul play was suspected, and a coroner's jury accused the Bishop of London's Chancellor of having a part in it. The anticlerical feeling was so strong in London that the Bishop appealed to Wolsey to intervene and to have the indictment declared untrue; he wrote:

> '. . . assured am I, if my Chancellor be tried by any twelve men in London, they do so maliciously set in favorem haereticae pravitatis that they will cast and condemn any clerk, though he were as innocent as Abel.'[2]

To stay the popular uproar, Hunne was charged with possessing manuscripts of Scripture which undoubtedly were "written after Wycliffe's copy" and which had such notes written on them that Sir Thomas More would declare "that no wise and good man could, after seeing them, doubt what 'naughty minds' the men had, both he that so noted them and he that so made them."[3] Also evidence was produced that Hunne had been in the habit of having midnight meetings

1. Vide Strype, Memorials, "Appendix," vol., V, pp. 370-380 for other confessions.
2. Ut per Gairdner, English Church, vide pp. 25-40.
3. Vide Francis Aidan Gasquet, The Eve of the Reformation (London: Simpkin & Co., 1900), 240.

with other heretics who read together in secret. Upon such evidence, Hunne was condemned as a heretic by a special court of twenty-eight divines, and by their order, his body was dug up and burned at Smithfield. The clergy thought the matter would end there, but the people took up his cause and made a hero out of the "heretic". The inquest went on, and the House of Commons passed a bill restoring Hunne's children. Burnet says, "after that day the city of London was never well affected to the popish clergy, but inclined to follow any body who spoke against them. . . ."[1]

Such injustices and abuses of power lowered the prestige of the clergy, and the immoralities in the private lives of many leading churchmen brought them into contempt. The new industrious middle class ridiculed the lazy friars and regarded the monks as useless. Many of the laity were offended at such superstitious practices as the sale of pardons and relics; the enormous wealth and costly shows of the higher clergy were resented by the lower clergy as well as the poor laymen; many of the noblemen regretted to see large sums of money leave the country to fill the coffers of popes who often used it in political manipulations against the interests of England. The people were rising, while the Church remained corrupt and powerless to change in keeping with the times. If the Church in England had been able to reform itself and make the necessary adjustments, there might have been, what Trevelyan calls, a "religious evolution" rather than "the religious revolution which we know as the Reformation."[2]

1. Bishop Burnet, History of the Reformation of the Church of England (new ed., 6 vols., London: J. F. Dove, 1820), I, 23.
2. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 245.

Such a religious evolution was attempted by "the Oxford Reformers." Although they failed in many ways, they made such significant contributions to the Reformation and indirectly gave such encouragement to the unofficial preachers, that we must briefly consider their message and work.

In 1497, John Colet, son of a London merchant, returned from Italy, the land of the Renaissance, to Oxford where he began his famous lectures on St. Paul's epistles. The abbots and doctors were astonished to hear this young man boldly by-pass the dialecticians of three hundred years and openly proclaim St. Paul's original meaning and its significance for contemporary hearers. By his brilliancy and sincerity, the glory of the scripture shone forth, and "the studies and learning of the Middle Ages crumbled like a corpse exposed to the air."[1] In 1505 Colet was appointed to the deanery of St. Paul's, where he continued in his plain habits of life and followed the advice he had given to his students -- "'keep to the Bible and the Apostles' Creed, letting divines, if they like, dispute about the rest.'"[2] Sunday after Sunday he preached on the Gospels, the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer; among the crowds which came to hear the earnest preacher were those whose cheeks were marked. By the time that Sweeting and Brewer were burned in 1511, the increase of heresy was evident, and many traced its cause to

1. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 290.
2. Frederic Seebohm, The Oxford Reformers of 1498: Being a History of the Fellow-work of John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1867), 84.

Dr. Colet's sermons. Nevertheless, when a convocation was summoned in 1512 to take action against the heretics, Colet was appointed by Archbishop Warham to preach the opening sermon. Taking his text from Romans 12:2, Colet declared the source of heresy to be the clergy's conformity to worldly amusements and secular occupations and the neglect of their spiritual duties; the need was not for the enactment of new laws and constitutions, but a reformation of the clergy after which the reformation of the laity would be easy.

> '. . . if priests themselves . . . were good, the people in their turn would become good also: for our own goodness would teach others how they may be good more clearly than all other kinds of teaching and preaching. Our goodness would urge them on in the right way far more efficaciously than all your suspension and excommunications.'[1]

Later Archbishop Warham dismissed the charges brought against Colet's school and the accusations that the Dean had preached against the worship of images and had translated the Paternoster into English. In 1513 Colet was brave enough to preach against young Henry's war in France, and the king was good enough to stand by the Dean — declaring, "'Let every one have his own doctor; . . . this man is the doctor for me.'"[2] However, the young king did not profit any more by his doctor's advice than did Wolsey heed Colet when upon the occasion of Wolsey's receiving the Cardinal's hat in 1515, the Dean had pointedly warned "'he who exalts himself shall be humbled.'" Nonetheless, others profited by the Dean's efforts, for Colet not only denounced the abuses and called for reform, but in all his preaching he exalted "the supreme importance of a really religious

1. Ut per Seebohm, op. cit., p. 176. Vide Lupton, Life of Dean Colet for fuller account of this great sermon.
2. Ut per Seebohm, op. cit., p. 195. Vide also pp. 191-195.

life over that of ecclesiastical machinery;" Erasmus spoke of Colet's greatest work as having been 'the implanting of Christ' in the hearts of the common people.[1]

Upon his coming to England in 1497, Erasmus, the Dutch scholar, was immediately attracted to Colet; in 1505 he wrote Enchiridion, the purpose of which he explained to Colet was "'to counteract the vulgar error of those who think that religion consists in ceremonies, . . . while they neglect what really pertains to piety.'"[2] In his satire, Praise of Folly, grammarians and schoolmen, kings and courtiers, monks and popes are all held up to ridicule; the wickedness of fictitious pardons, the sale of indulgences, the superstitious attributing of virtues to images and shrines, the running away from duties at home to go on pilgrimages—are all condemned. After describing the popes as living "'as though Christ were dead'" and rebuking them for "'warring, conquering, triumphing, and openly acting the Ceasar,'" Folly concludes her address by reminding her audience that only "Folly" has spoken, but adds: "'A fool oft speaks a seasonable truth.'"[3] It seems that many people agreed that "Folly" had spoken many truths, for this work passed through seven editions within a few months of its first printing (1511) and prepared the way for others who would take more drastic action against such evils as the sale of indulgences. However, Erasmus' greatest work was his

1. Henry W. Clark, History of English Non-Conformity, From Wyclif to the Close of the Nineteenth Century (2 vols., London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1911), I, 87-88.
2. Ut per Seebohm, op. cit., p. 89.
3. Ibid., pp. 125-135 passim. (126, 134, 135, 252).

edition of the New Testament in the original Greek with a new and free Latin translation of his own, which was printed in Basel in 1516; this was the work which both Luther and Tyndale were to use for their translations. Erasmus feard "'lest under the pretext of the revival of ancient literature, Paganism should again endeavour to rear its head'";[1] and so in his preface to the Novum Instrumentum, he calls upon those of the free thinking philosophic school to examine the philosophy of Christ with 'a pious and open heart.' To the schoolmen who opposed all free inquiry and who scornfully pointed to the sceptical tendencies of the Italian school as the result to which the new learning must inevitably lead, Erasmus appealed that they study the Gospels themselves rather than spend all their time studying the writings of the learned doctors; for, he declared, whereas images present only the form of Christ's body, "'these books present us with a living image of his most holy mind.'"[2] He disagreed with those who were "'unwilling that the sacred Scriptures should be read by the unlearned translated into their vulgar tongue'"; for, he argued that Christ's teachings were not so difficult that only a few theologians could understand them and that the strength of the Christian faith was certainly not in men's ignorance of it. Then in words which were doubtless to inspire many men, Erasmus declared:

> 'I wish that even the weakest woman should read the Gospel — should read the epistles of Paul. And I wish these were translated into all languages, so that they might be read and understood, not only by Scots and Irishmen, but also by Turks and Saracens. To make them understood is

1. Ut per Seebohm, op. cit., p. 251.
2. Ibid., pp. 257-258.

> surely the first step. It may be that they might be ridiculed by many, but some would take them to heart. I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey.'[1]

As a youth at Oxford, Sir Thomas More had become so enthusiastic for the "new learning" that his father, fearing that his religious orthodoxy might suffer, called him (1494) to study law in London, where, nevertheless, he continued his studies and came to know Colet and Erasmus intimately. His witty Latin epigrams show a disgust of the insincerity and ignorance he found in many of the priests; in 1510, he completed his translation of the works of Pico, a disciple of Savonarola, who had taught and practised a simple and practical kind of faith. In 1515, More wrote his "Utopia" which satirizes the contemporary governments and conditions of Europe and presents an ideal commonwealth where there would be neither aristocrat nor beggar but "one people, well-to-do and educated throughout."[2] As the laws of nature and the truths of Christianity are framed by the same Founder, More argues that the two must be in harmony; therefore, through the whole work, there is "fearless faith in science, combined with a profound faith in religion."[3] In Utopia no man was to be punished for his religion; he may use arguments to induce others to accept it, but if he resorted to reproaches and violence he was to be banished for creating a disturbance. More realized that such things were more to be wished for than hoped for in his time;

1. Ut per Seebohm, op. cit., p. 256.
2. Seebohm, op. cit., p. 282.
3. Ibid., p. 284.

yet he thought that a good statesman might so order what was bad, "that it be not very bad."[1] Like his friends, Colet and Erasmus, More trusted to the enlightenment of leaders and to the progress of education to overcome ignorance and superstition; he expected the reformation to come from within the Church; he never contemplated achieving reform by violent means. In 1518 when More was persuaded to enter the king's service, there were great hopes of such reformation; Wolsey was establishing new colleges and appeared to be on the verge of initiating a reformation; young Henry seemed weary of the wars and wanted to become a patron of scholars and thinkers. Erasmus wrote that the English court seemed 'rather a university than a court' and that at last the world was awakening out of its deep sleep; the Golden Age of law, order, universal peace and learning seemed to be dawning.[2] 1518 marks the highest expectations for the Apostles of the "new learning", for it soon became increasingly evident that the new Age would not be born without severe birth pains.

Realizing that the corruption and ignorance of the clergy had caused it to fall into "great disesteem with the people,"[3] Cardinal Wolsey undertook a reformation of the inferior clergy. Having obtained a bull from Rome, he visited some of the monasteries and upon the charge of their corruption, he suppressed about forty of them or converted them into bishopricks or colleges; thus he taught Henry how the wealth of other monasteries could be confiscated. Later (1522)

1. Vide Dictionary of National Biography, "Sir Thomas More," vol. XXXVIII, p. 432.
2. R. W. Chambers, Thomas More (London: Jonathan Cape, 1935), 168-169 passim.
3. Burnet, Hist. of Reform. vol. I, p. 31.

he called a convocation to reform the abuses of the church, but it resulted only in his forcing the clergy to give the king half of the full value of their livings for one year — which also became a lesson which the king would not forget. Such was the extent of Wolsey's efforts of reformation; he seemed only concerned in those "reforms" which were beneficial to himself or to his royal master. Despite his great abilities and incontestable power, the Cardinal, whom the queen had rebuked on account of the scandals which his private sins had brought upon the church,[1] was not the man to institute reform.[2] His vanity, his ostentation, his elaborate entertainment, his costly building, his abuse of power, his pride which caused him to omit the humble acts of adoration in saying mass, his own notorious vices and scandalous sins — all these disqualified him from reforming others whose "faults were neither so great nor so eminent" as his own.[3]

In 1517, when Erasmus was busy revising his Greek Testament, Pope Leo X issued commissions for the sale of indulgences, of which Erasmus wrote to Colet the next year:

> 'The Court of Rome clearly has lost all sense of shame; for what could be more shameless than these continued indulgences? Now a war against the Turks is put forth as a pretext, when the real purpose is to drive the Spaniards from Naples. . . . If these turmoils continue, the rule of the Turks would be easier to bear than that of these Christians.'[4]

1. Henry Soames, History of the Reformation (London: printed for C. &. J. Rivington, 1826), I, 180.
2. Vide Constant, La Réforme En Angleterre, notes pp. 309-310. "Malgré ses grandes qualités et son incontestable supériorité, leur chef, le cardinal et légat Wolsey, ce fils de marchand élevé à une fortune insolente, ne leur donnait point l'exemple par son faste, son arrogance, son amour des richesses, la négligence de ses devoirs d'état et la conduite de sa vie privee." p. 10.
3. Burnet, Hist. of Reform. p. 30.
4. Ut per Seebohm, op. cit., p. 351.

However, in 1519, in a reply to a letter from Martin Luther whom he addressed as a 'brother in Christ', Erasmus said that it seemed to him that more good would come of courteous modesty than of impetuosity; he thought it "better to exclaim against the abuses of pontifical authority than against the Popes themselves."[1] He declined Cardinal Wolsey's efforts to enlist his service in confuting Luther's books by saying that he was too busy with his own books to read Luther's and added that he understood that Luther's life was such that not even his enemies could find anything to slander; besides if Luther and other German students were too free in their criticism, he would remind the Cardinal to what "constant exasperation they had been submitted in all manner of ways, both public and private."[2]

> 'In my opinion,' Erasmus wrote in 1519, 'many might be reconciled to the Church of Rome if, instead of everything being defined, we were contented with what is evidently set forth in the Scriptures as necessary to salvation. And these things are few in number, and the fewer the easier for many to accept. . . .
> . . . . . .
> Lastly it would tend greatly to the establishment of concord, if secular princes, and especially the Roman Pontiff, would abstain from all tyranny and avarice. For men easily revolt when they see preparations for enslaving them. . . .'[3]

Whereas Erasmus was reluctant to enter the Lutheran controversy, Henry VIII came to the aid of the Church by writing "Defensio Septem Sacramentorum" and was rewarded the title "Fidei Defensor" by the Pope. When Luther replied with a blistering attack on the king, More entered the battle (1523); he appealed to 'illustrious Germany' to reject Luther and to reassert its faith in the papacy, to which More believed

1. Seebohm, op. cit., p. 402.
2. Ibid., p. 403.
3. Ut per Seebohm, op. cit., pp. 412-413.

God would yet raise up "'such popes as befit the dignity of the apostolic office.'"[1] In 1525 Erasmus expressed fear for 'this miserable Luther' and entered the battle against the German reformer, a battle which was to accomplish such a reaction in the Dutch scholar that he could write to Pope Leo X: "'Would that I were allowed to fall down before you and kiss those truly blessed feet.'"[2] However, More was soon to find a more immediate opponent who would engage the remainder of his life in a struggle for the allegiance of his own illustrative England.

William Tyndale was himself a child of the new learning; he was "brought up" at Oxford when the new learning was in full bloom; Foxe depicts him lying in Magdalen Hall, reading "privily to certain students and fellows . . . some parcel of divinity; instructing them in the knowledge and truth of the Scriptures."[3] At Cambridge, Tyndale came under the stimulating influence of Erasmus, whom he, in his earlier life, regarded "with feelings of the most profound admiration."[4] It could have been of his reputation at Oxford and Cambridge that Sir Thomas More had later to acknowledge that he was "'well-known . . . for a man of right good living, studious and well learned in scripture,'" although he "'smacked somewhat of heresy!'"[5] Luther's

1. Ut per Dictionary of National Biography, XXXVIII, p. 434.
2. Ut per Clark, op. cit., vol. I, p. 91. Clark suggests that Luther's rough manner and method had offended Erasmus and had produced "something like a reaction in his own mind"; his attitude became hesitating, inconsistent; "he deprecated the logical consequences of his own statements: he dropped into the rather pitiful position of a man striving to show that he does not mean so very much after all." Clark, op. cit., vol. I, p. 89.
3. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, p. 115.
4. R. Demaus, William Tyndale (new ed., revised Richard Lovett, London: Religious Tract Soc., 1886), 44.
5. Ut per J. F. Mozley, William Tyndale (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937), 19.

writings already were infiltrating among the students, causing some of the new learning to draw back to defend orthodoxy while others moved forward with the German reformer; Trevelyan suggests that Tyndale was already among the later.[1] In 1520 Wolsey made a triumphant visit to the university, and in the next year Luther's writings were publicly burned; Tyndale might have witnessed both. Shortly, thereafter, Tyndale left Cambridge to become a tutor in the household of Sir John Walsh, whom Tyndale offended by arguing with the abbots and doctors who frequented his table; whereupon he presented to his master and lady a translation of Erasmus' Enchiridion Militis Christiana which won them over to his opinions. Foxe tells of priests "flocking together to the alehouse," raging and railing against Tyndale, "affirming that his sayings were heresy; adding moreover unto his sayings, of their own heads, more than ever he spake, and so accused him secretly to the chancellor. . . ."[2] As a result of such experiences, Tyndale resolved (1522?) to translate the New Testament into English; he perceived

> 'how that it was impossible to establish the lay-people in any truth, except the Scripture were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother-tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text: for else, whatsoever truth is taught them, these enemies of all truth quench it again, partly with the smoke of their bottomless pit . . . and partly in juggling with the text. . . .'[3]

Foxe relates an incident of Tyndale's disputing with a learned man who exclaimed, in the heat of the argument, 'we were better to be without God's laws than the pope's;' to which Tyndale exclaimed,

1. Trevelyan, Hist of Engl., p. 300.
2. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, p. 116.
3. Ut per S. L. Greenslade, The Work of William Tindale (London: Blackie & Son Limited, 1938), 96.

'I defy the pope and all his laws; . . . if God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scripture than thou.'[1] Needing an episcopal patron who would take the responsibility for such an enterprise[2] and remembering Erasmus' commendation of the Bishop of London, Tyndale intended to do the work in his house. The Bishop, however, answered that his house was full and suggested he seek employment elsewhere in London. Befriended by a devout cloth-merchant, Humphrey Monmouth, in whose house he lived half a year, Tyndale 'lived like a good priest,' according to the testimony which Monmouth later was forced to give; 'he studied most part of the day and of the night at his book, and he would eat but sodden meat by his good will, nor drink but small single beer.'[3] In 1523 London was in a turmoil over the demands Wolsey made on Parliament and the clergy; in contrast the news from the continent told of Luther's successfully defying the papacy and of more freedom in printing than in England. Of that year he spent in London, Tyndale wrote he

> 'marked the course of the world, and heard our praters (I would say our preachers) how they boasted themselves and their high authority, and beheld the pomp of our prelates . . . and understood at the last, not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament but also that there was no place to do it in all England. . . .'[4]

1. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, p. 117.
2. Records of the English Bible, ed. Alfred W. Pollard (London: Oxford University Press, 1911), 79. The prohibition against unauthorized translations of 1408 was still in effect: "Scriptura sacra non transferatur in linguam vulgarem nec translata interpretur donec rite fuerit examinata sub pena excommunicationis et nota hereseos."
3. Ut per Mozley, op. cit., p. 46.
4. Ibid., p. 49. Vide Pollard, Records, pp. 93-98 for Tyndale's story of his translation.

In the spring of 1524, Tyndale sailed from England, as one of the first of the religious exiles who would seek refuge on the continent; he was not forced to flee for his life; he chose to go for the sake of the work which he considered more important.

In December of the following year (1525), Henry VIII was informed that

> 'an englishman your subiect at the sollicitacion and instaunce of Luther, with whome he is, hathe translated the newe testament in to Englishe, and within four dayes entendethe to arrive with the same emprinted in England. I nede not to aduertise your grace, what infection and daunger maye ensue heerbie, if it bee not withstonded.'[1]

Copies of Tyndale's work began reaching England early in 1526; and despite the withstanding of Chancellor, Cardinal and King, they kept on coming from across the channel. Sir Thomas More denounced 'that boke' as a corruption of the holy doctrine of Christ into 'the devylysh heresyes' of Tyndale and Luther; Wolsey tried to crush its traffic, and the Bishop of London burned all the copies he could find; the king made it a crime to possess the 'erroneous' translation and promised if the people 'utterly abandon and forsake' it, he would cause a proper one to be made at such a time as it might be convenient to his grace.[2] Tyndale offered to abide the king's pleasure if only he would 'graunte . . . a bare text of the scriptures to be put forthe emonge h[is] people.'[3] In the meantime, while Tyndale worked on in this hope, even to his dying breath, the people so longed after the gospel that they were not willing to abandon an 'imperfect'

1. Edward Lee, as quoted by Pollard, Records, pp. 108-109.
2. "Royal Proclamation, 1530," Pollard, Records, p. 168.
3. Vaughan's letter to Henry VIII, Pollard, Records, pp. 170-171.

translation for the promise of a better one.[1] Many had heard Colet's sermons; fewer read Erasmus' Greek Testament; but Tyndale's English translation came to the people as the fruit of the new learning and in turn brought forth many abundant harvests.

The prohibited work could only be read in private or "in secret societies, where the brethren knew each other and helped each other to evade inquiries."[2] If Wycliffe had his hundreds, Tyndale must have had his thousands; for the printing press made the scriptures more available, and the social changes were producing a new spirit of inquiry. Those who treasured bits of manuscripts of the Wycliffite translation were eager to trade them for the newly printed English Testament. In his confession of April 28, 1528, John Tybal admits having come to London with Thomas Hilles as early as September 1526 to buy a New Testament in English. Finding Friar Barnes in his chamber at the Friars Augustines, where a merchantman was reading out of a book to two or three others, -- they, after cautious identification, showed

> 'certain old books that they had: as of the four Evangelists, and certain Epistles of Peter and Paul in English; which books the said Friar did little regard, and made a twit of it, and said -- "a point for them! for they be not to be regarded toward the new printed Testament in English; for it is of more cleaner English." And then the said Friar Barnes delivered to them the said New Testament in English, for which they paid iii. sh., ii. d.; and desired them that they should keep it close. . . .'[3]

Anderson is sure that we have Hilles' confession, under the title of

1. Vide H. Wheller Robinson, The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), 153.
2. Gairdner, English Church., p. 91.
3. As quoted by Anderson, Annals, vol. I, p. 184.

'the confession of a Lollard', among the Harleian Manuscripts; the 'Lollard' states that he also purchased a Testament, which he read from house to house and that he and Sir Richard Fox, John Tybal, Friar Gardyner and Friar Topley

> 'used to resort sometime to Bower Hall [the manor-house of the Bumstead estate]. . . and there . . . would read chapters of Scripture, and in the New Testament, in English, in presence of them and their household.'[1]

Of the little groups which gathered around the Word, especially in London, Colchester and other parts of Essex, Strype says:

> The New Testament in English, translated by Hotchyn, (that is, Tindal) was in many hands, and read with great application and joy: The doctrines of the corporeal presence, of worshipping images, and going on pilgrimages to saints, would not down. And they had secret meetings, wherein they instructed one another out of God's word.[2]

In Hacker's confession in 1527, parts of which we have already considered, we learn that whereas Hacker had been "a great reader and teacher about six years past in London," he was in 1527 "now in the parts of Essex about Colchester, Wittham, and Branktree."[3] In addition to those whom we have already mentioned, Hacker revealed the following as being of his "learning and sort": Thomas Vincent, Thomas Austie, John Stacy, Elizabeth Newman, John Tewksbury, Dorothy Lang, Marion Westden, Thomas Geffray, Mrs. Styes, Thomas and Robert Tyllesworth, Stephen Carde, William Mason, John Houshold, Goter, Stere and Knight, of S. Margaret Lothbury.[4] John Pykas, who told of being given 'one book of Pawles Epistoles' by his mother, also

1. As quoted by Anderson, Annals, vol. I, p. 185.
2. Strype, Memorials, vol. I, p. 115.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., pp. 116-118.

confessed:

> 'About a two yeres last past, he bowght in Colchestre, of a Lumbard of London, a New Testament in English, and payd for it foure shillinges. Which New Testament he kept, and read it thorowghly many tymes. . . . by the instruction of his mother, and by reading of the said books, he fell into these errors and heresies ayenst the sacrament of the altar . . . which heresie he hath divers tyme spoken and tawght. . . .'[1]

Pykas lists the houses where he taught and the audience which he addressed therein: (1) house of Thomas Matthew: Matthew's wife, William Pykas, Maryon Westden; (2) house of John Thompson (a flecher): Dorothy Lane, Robert Best, Mestress Swayn, John Gyrlyng; (3) John Bradley (a blacksmith) he and his wife; (4) Thomas Parker (weaver): his family; (5) Margaret Bowgas (the wife of Thomas Bowgas); (6) Mestress Cambridge (a widow of Colchester); (7) house of John Hubbert: Robert Bate and Richard Collins; (8) house of John Wyley (a weaver of Horkesley). Pykas affirmed that he had "often and many tymes . . . had communication" with these persons and that he had "tawght, rehersed and affirmed, before all the said persons, and in their houses at sondry tymes."[2]

Robert Necton confessed that he had "kept and studied" the New Testament and that not only did he read it himself "but read and taught it to divers others."[3] John Tewksbury, a leather-merchant in London, confessed possessing a manuscript copy of the Scriptures and admitted that he had been studying in the holy Scriptures from the year 1512; however, he testified that it was Tyndale's New Testament which had brought him to "the knowledge of the truth." Tewksbury's

1. As given by Strype, Memorials, vol. I, p. 123.
2. Strype, Memorials, vol. I, pp. 123-124.
3. Anderson, Annals, vol. I, p. 190.

accusers were surprised to find a leather-seller "with such power of the Scriptures, and heavenly wisdom, that they were not able to resist him"; the leather-seller had the courage to say to the distinguished Bishops who sat in judgment upon him: "'I pray God that the condemnation of the Gospel and translation of the Testament, be not to your shame, and that ye be not in peril for it.'"[1] With such as the leather-seller, other men of higher society arose to proclaim that the people should have free access to the New Testament in English 'as it is'; Mr. James Bainham, son of a knight of Gloucestershire and a member of the Middle Temple, was arrested in 1532 and kept for a time in More's own house at Chelsea. Despite the tortures he did not accuse any of his acquaintances, but after two months of confinement and torture he read his abjuration; he was fined and ordered to wear a faggot upon his shoulder. However, he came to lament what he had done. Foxe says:

> He was never quiet in mind and conscience, until the time he had uttered his fall to all his acquaintance, and asked God and all the world forgiveness, before the Congregation in those days, in a warehouse in Bow-Lane. And immediately, the next Sunday after, he came to St. Austin's, with the New Testament in his hand in English, and the Obedience of a Christian Man in his bosom, and stood up there before the people in his pew, there declaring openly, with weeping tears, that he had denied God; and prayed all the people to forgive him, and to beware of his weakness, and not to do as he had done. . . .[2]

He wrote a letter to the Bishop of London, renouncing his abjuration, and was again committed to the Tower, from which on the first of May, 1532, he was led forth to join that host of brave martyrs who died in the flames that every man and woman might have 'God's book in their

1. Ut per Anderson, Annals, vol. I, p. 211.
2. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. IV, p. 702.

mother tongue.'[1] "The Congregation in Bow-Lane" certainly suggests an irregular meeting, quite distinct from St. Austin's where Bainham had a pew; was it not an assembly of 'known men and women,' for whom his abjuration had special significance? Foxe's use of the word "Congregation" suggests more organization than we have heretofore known among the Bible-clusters, but the term could have been used without any such significance.[2]

Fryth, Tyndale's friend and helper, also testifies to these great numbers which clustered around the Word; while a prisoner in the Tower of London, he wrote (1532):

> 'It cannot be expressed, dearly beloved in the Lord, what joy and comfort it is to my heart, to perceive how the Word of God hath wrought, and continually worketh among you; so that I find no small number walking in the ways of the Lord, according as he gave us commandment, willing that we should love one another.'[3]

Facing the fires, Fryth was confident that God would soon change their condition; there was then evidence of great changes in the making, for the Reformation Parliament had already been summoned and had begun its work.

Parliament had been summoned in 1529, to strengthen the king's hand in his efforts to secure a divorce from Catherine. Whereas the pope had recently granted a separation to Henry's sister, Margaret, and had released Louis XII from his wife "on no grounds save reasons of state,"[4] he could not oblige Henry, even if he had so desired, as

1. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. IV, p. 705.
2. Vide Anderson, Annals, vol. I, p. 334.
3. Ut per Anderson, Annals, vol. I, p. 344.
4. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 301.

he was virtually a prisoner of Charles V who was Catherine's nephew and zealous protector. The English ambassador to the emperor was instructed to explain that the divorce question had not arisen out of a political quarrel but

> 'that whereas the king for some years past had noticed in reading the Bible the severe penalty inflicted by God on those who married the relicts of their brothers, he began to be troubled in his conscience and to regard the sudden deaths of his male children as a Divine judgement. The more he studied the matter, the more clearly it appeared to him that he had broken a Divine law.'[1]

In this statement, the king was appealing to the authority of the scriptures as superior to that of the papacy, for the papacy had granted the necessary dispensation for his marriage with Catherine; even the pope could not set aside "a Divine Law." However, as Henry wanted a legitimate male heir, he waited for the papacy to clear up the matter and to grant him license to marry a younger queen. When there were only delays and temporizings forth coming from Rome, Henry came to resent the papal inability to act apart from the political maneuvers of English enemies; Trevelyan says:

> In his anger at this personal grievance, he came to see what many Englishmen had long seen before, that England, if she would be a nation indeed, must repudiate a spiritual jurisdiction manipulated by her foreign rivals and enemies. The full-grown spirit of English nationalism, maturing ever since Plantagenet times, asked why we should look abroad for any part of our laws, either matrimonial or religious. Why not consult our own churchmen? Why not act through our own Parliament?

The House of Commons did not delay in voicing the popular discontent against the clergy; it passed bills regulating the probates of wills

1. As quoted by Chambers, op. cit., pp. 225-226. Cf. Lev. 20:21 & Lev. 18:16. Vide Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. I, pp. 54-56; Soames, Hist. of Reform., vol. I, pp. 177-190; Constant, op. cit., pp. 18-45 for the history of Henry's "great matter."
2. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 301.

and mortuaries, preventing clerical farming and trading, and restraining pluralities and non-residence; the latter was directed against Rome, for it was stated that any papal dispensation in this matter would be void and that any clergyman who received such would be penalized. Bishop Fisher declared such measures to be 'symptomatic of heresy,' but he was powerless to check the anticlerical revolution.[1] In February of 1530 Henry began gathering the opinions of eminent scholars and of the universities on his "great matter"; a remonstrance from the English aristocracy intimated that if Clement should "disappoint the reasonable expectations of the applicants, their sovereign's cause would be decided in England, without the intervention of the Roman see."[2] The pope hastened to answer, entreating them to lay aside such a menacing intimation; but Henry had already issued a royal proclamation which prohibited any papal bull from entering his dominions and interfering with his prerogatives. In November 1530, Wolsey was arrested on the charge of treason, but he died a few weeks before he could be tried. However, a prosecution was instituted in the King's Court against the whole clergy for having submitted to the legative authority which Wolsey had exercised. Being unpopular with the people, the clergy realized their great danger, and in a convocation of the southern province they voted an enormous sum to the king, as an acknowledgment of his majesty's services to the church in writing against Luther, in repressing heresy, and in protecting the clergy against the insults of their enemies. The king, however, was not satisfied with just the payment of money, but also desired

1. Soames, op. cit., vol. I, p. 246.
2. Ibid., p. 272.

that they should acknowledge him as the sole protector and supreme head of the church and clergy of England. As Fuller says, "This was hard meat, and would not easily down amongst them."[1] After much discussion and several efforts to flavor such a hard morsel, the convocation submitted to the title of 'supreme head, so far as it is allowed by the law of Christ.'[2] The convocation of the northern province also granted a huge gift of money but was reluctant to concede even the qualified title; however, the king's insistence upon his right to direct all affairs within his dominions at length prevailed, and the northern convocation submitted. This consent was afterwards confirmed by Act of Parliament, and the Crown formally granted an indemnity from all charges of having submitted to the legatine authority of Wolsey. Upon the death of Warham, Cranmer was consecrated (1533) Archbishop of Canterbury; a court was soon called, and the king's great matter was quickly settled; Anne Boleyn was crowned queen of England. After this open defiance of the pope, Henry prepared his kingdom against the papal anger; Strype quotes an address to the people, by which Henry sought to vindicate his action against "the great idol and most cruel enemy to Christ's law and his religion, which calleth himself Pope."[3] The pontiff was herein reduced to the bishop of Rome, a foreign, corrupt prelate whom

> all true Christen people, except he amend, ought to dispise both him, and all his facts, and be no longer blinded by

1. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 34.
2. Ibid., "Cujus (ecclesiae Anglicanae) singularem protectorem, unicum et supremum dominum, et (quantum per Christi leges licet supremum caput ipsius mjestatem recognoscimus."
3. Strype, Memorials, vol. I, p. 233. Vide pp. 232-237.

> him: but give themselves intyrely to the observance of Christ's lawes, in which is all sweetness and truth. . . .[1]

Parliament enacted other anti-papal measures as the prohibition of the payment of first fruits to Rome, the appeal to the pope over the king's courts, the convocation of the clergy without the king's writ, the appointment of bishops and others by the papal authority and the payment of Peter's pence or other impositions to Rome; in 1534 the Parliament approved the Act of Supremacy, the first and second Acts of Succession and the Treasons Act.[2] Upon his refusal to yield the papal supremacy, Bishop Fisher was imprisoned; when the pope made him a cardinal, Henry signed his death warrant. Sir Thomas More, on the same charge of treason, followed him to the block in 1535. Their deaths symbolized the complete break with the Roman Papacy and the fury of an anticlerical revolution which Henry had let loose in the land.

One of the chief factors in preventing this anticlerical revolution from becoming an anti-religious one was the English Bible. Trevelyan says:

> The English Reformation, which had begun as a Parliamentary attack on Church fees, and proceeded as a royal raid on Abbey lands, was at last to find its religious basis in the popular knowledge of the Scriptures which had been the dream of Wycliffe.[3]

However, many of the ecclesiastical authorities did everything they could to suppress Tyndale's translation; Hitton (1530), Bilmey (1531), Bayfield (1531), Tewkesbury (1531), Bainham (1532), Harding (1532), Frith and Hewet (1533) — had all been burned because they possessed

1. Strype, Memorials, vol. I, p. 236.
2. Vide Henry Gee & William John Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London: Macmillan, 1914), 178-232.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 310.

copies of the forbidden book or had distributed them to others. However, by 1534 it was becoming evident that "the heretics who had been emboldened to keep up, even from the first, an agitation in favour of an English Bible" were winning their struggle against the bishops who, in Gairdner's words,

> notwithstanding all their self-sacrifice . . . had found that the art of printing, the industry of Tyndale, and the enterprise of merchants in importing forbidden literature had made it really impossible to stop the circulation of translations which they considered objectionable, without setting forth a better.[1]

In December 1534, the bishops petitioned the king that

> the holy scripture shall be translated into the vulgar English tongue by certain upright and learned men . . . and be meted out and delivered to the people for their instruction. And moreover that his royal majesty should think fit to forbid and command, with a penalty assigned and imposed, that no layman or secular person among his subjects should for the future presume publicly to dispute or in any manner to wrangle concerning the catholic faith, or the articles of the faith, the Holy Scripture or its meaning.[2]

The following spring (May 1535), the 'Captain of our English heretics', as More had called Tyndale, was trapped and imprisoned. For more than a year Tyndale lay in prison, still working on the Old Testament; letters from the English merchants were sent on his behalf, but no response came officially from England. Although Henry had liked "The Obedience of a Christian Man" and claimed it "for me and all kings to read," he had not favored "The Practice of Prelates," and doubtless remembered that Tyndale had not favored his divorce; Cromwell made some gesture of interest, but nothing was done to save him. Within the year that Tyndale died, crying to God to open the eyes of

1. Gairdner, Lollardry and the Reform., vol. II, p. 261.
2. Pollard, Records, p. 177.

the king of England, Coverdale's complete translation of the Bible appeared, with a dedication to Henry VIII as "the true defender and maynteyner of Gods lawes" and with a remembrance of "the aduersite of them, which were not onely of rype knowledge, but wolde also with all theyr hertes haue perfourmed that they beganne, yf they had not had impediment."[1] In 1537 "Matthew's Bible" appeared which also was dedicated to the king and which included Tyndale's last manuscripts; Cranmer liked it better than any other translation and requested Cromwell

> 'to exhibite the boke unto the kinges highnes; and to obteign of his Grace, if you can, a license that the same may be sold and redde of euery person, withoute danger of any acte, proclamacion, or ordinaunce hertofore graunted to the contrary, vntill such tyme that we, the Bishops shall set forth a better translacion, which I thinke will not be till a day after domesday.'[2]

Despite the displeasure of other bishops, the king granted his license that it might "freely passe to be read by hys subiects," and after some difficulty in getting it printed in France, it was published in 1539 as the first of the Great Bibles. Injunctions were issued by Cromwell that "one boke of the whole Bible . . . in Englyshe" was to be set up "in summe convenyent place" in every church in England; no man was to be discouraged from reading or hearing these chained Bibles, but the people were admonished

> 'to avoid all contention, altercation therin, and to use an honest sobrietye in the inquisition of the true sense of the same, and referre th' explication of obscure places, to men of higher jugement in Scripture.'[3]

However, in May of 1541 there were still churches without Bibles so

1. Pollard, Records, pp. 201, 202-203.
2. Ut per Pollard, Records, p. 215.
3. Ibid., pp. 261-262, footnote.

that in a Royal Proclamation issued in that month a penalty of forty shillings was threatened against all parishes which were not so provided by All Saints Day. Again there were cautions in its use: no one was to read the said Bibles

> 'wyth lowde and hyghe voyces, in tyme of the celebracion of the holye Masse and other dyuyne seruyces vsed in the churche, nor that any hys lay subiectes redynge the same, shulde presume to take vpon them, any common dysputacyon, argumente or exposicyon of the mysteries therein conteyned, but that euery suche laye man shoulde humbly, mekely and reuerentlye reade the same, for his owne instruction, edificacion, and amendement of hys lyfe, accordynge to goddes holy worde therin mencioned.'[1]

The birth of Edward VI on October 12, 1537 insured the Reformation, but the long-expected papal excommunication in December of 1538 threatened Henry with invasions and uprisings. In fear of uniting the emperor and the French king against him, he declined an alliance with the Protestant princes of Germany; and "to show himself as good a Christian as any Continental sovereign,"[2] he continued to burn heretics. Parliament was assembled in April of 1539 to take precautions against an attack and to stamp out "'the diversities of minds and opinions, especially of matters of Christian religion.'"[3] The Six Articles Act, which became 'a whip with six strings' to the reformers, was passed in June of 1539, and the progress of the Reformation, for a time, was checked. The doctrine of transubstantiation was upheld by law; communion was limited to one kind; all clerical marriages were dissolved, and all vows of chastity or

1. Ut per, Pollard, Records, p. 263.
2. Gairdner, Lollardry, vol. II, p. 287.
3. The Six Articles Act, 1539, Documents, (Gee & Hardy), p. 303.

widowhood were to be maintained; private masses were permitted to continue, and auricular confession was to be enforced.[1] The influence of the reformers waned: Cranmer displeased the king by opposing his misappropriation of the monasterial wealth; Shaxton and Latimer were imprisoned for speaking against the Six Articles, and Cromwell was beheaded on account of the king's disappointment with Anne of Cleves.

Gardiner, Bonner and others of the "old learning" tried to regain what they had lost; they attacked the licensed translation, but Cranmer forestalled their intended revision by persuading the king to refer the translation to the two Universities. They were more successful in acquainting the king with the excitement caused by the reading of the Scripture. From a contemporary document we can learn of the reception the Church-Bibles had received among the people:

> 'It was wonderful to see with what joy this book of God was received not only among the learneder sort, but generally all England over, among all the vulgar and common people; and with what greediness God's Word was read, and what resort to places where the reading of it was! Every body that could, bought the book, or busily read it, or got others to read it to them, if they could not themselves. Divers more elderly people learned to read on purpose; and even little boys flocked, among the rest, to hear portions of the Holy Scripture read.'[2]

In St. Paul's crowds of people gathered to hear any one who could read with a clear voice; when they heard Christ say, 'Drink ye all of it,' they asked why the cup was denied to them.[3] Robinson says that such a rivalry developed between the Bible reading and the church

1. The Six Articles Act, 1539, Documents, (Gee & Hardy), pp. 303-309.
2. Ut per Anderson, Annals, vol. II, p. 41.
3. Burnet, Hist. of Reform. vol. I, p. 468.

service that "there grew up a habit of reciting the Bible aloud during the service, and the people were prosecuted 'for disturbing the service of the church, with babbling of the New Testament.'"[1] Bonner posted an admonition in which he threatened to remove these Bibles out of the churches, if the people continued "to abuse so high a favour."[2] Of these unauthorized preachers, we have only the records of their arrest; Foxe tells us of one John Porter,

> a fresh young man and of a big stature who, by diligent reading of the Scripture, and by hearing of such sermons as then were preached by them that were the setters-forth of God's truth became very expert.[3]

Great crowds gathered in St. Paul's to hear Porter read from one of the chained Bibles, because "he could read well, and had an audible voice." Bonner rebuked Porter ("the world beginning then to frown upon the gospellers"); Porter replied that he trusted he had done nothing contrary to the law. The bishop then charged him with making expositions upon the text and with gathering a tumultous multitude. Porter replied that he trusted that should not be proved against him; however, he was sent to Newgate prison. Later when he began to exhort his fellow prisoners to amend their lives, he was put in the lower dungeon, from which came such piteous groans that it was supposed he was put in the strait irons, called 'the devil on the neck'; the next morning he was found dead.[4]

Gairdner tells of an incident of one Tornaye or Torner, a soldier of the garrison at Calais, whose Bible reading in the church

1. Robinson, op. cit., p. 179.
2. Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. I, p. 468.
3. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, pp. 451-452.
4. Ibid.

of Our Lady was interrupted by one of the Calais clergy on the charge that he was interspersing exposition with his reading. As a result of the dispute which followed, Lord Lisle gave orders that the Bible should be read no more during mass or service time, but this raised a complaint by those who 'favoured God's Word' that the reading of the Bible should be forbidden at any time. Finally, the archbishop had to intervene by writing Lord Lisle:

> 'As concerning such persons as in time of divine service do read the Bible, they do much abuse the King's Grace's intent and meaning in his Grace's injunctions and proclamations; which permitteth the Bible to be read, not to allure great multitudes of people together, nor thereby to interrupt the time of prayer, meditation and thanks to be given unto Almighty God, which, specially in divine service, is, and of congruence ought to be, used; but that the same be done and read in time convenient, privately, for the condition and amendment of the lives both of the readers and of such hearers as cannot themselves read, and not in contempt and hindrance of any divine service or laudable ceremony used in the Church; nor that any such reading should be used in the Church as in a common school, expounding and interpreting Scriptures, unless it be by such as shall have authority to preach and read.'[1]

The king was informed that the common people were not only causing disturbances in the churches but that they were also debating the most difficult points of theology in such places as the taverns and ale-houses and that they were making rhymes of the scriptures and of those doctrines which he had approved. He issued a Proclamation, confining the Bible reading to private individuals and prohibiting any exposition except by curates, graduates or those who had licenses to teach or preach; if doubts or questions arose out of the private reading, the reader was urged 'to resort for instruction to such as were learned in the holy scriptures.'[2] In 1543 the matter was

1. Ut per Gairdner, Lollardry, vol. II, pp. 341-343.
2. Strype, Memorials, vol. I, p. 567.

presented in Parliament, and an act was passed which stated:

> 'That no manner of person or persons, after the first day of October next ensuing, shall take upon him or them to read, preach, or teach openly to other [s] in any church or open assembly within any the King's dominions, the Bible or any part of Scripture in English; or by any other person or persons cause it or any part thereof openly to be read, preached or taught to other in any church or open assembly as is aforesaid, unless he be so appointed thereunto by the King's Majesty or by any ordinary, or by such as have rule, government and authority to make deputation or assignment of the same, upon pain that every such offender . . . shall suffer imprisonment of one month.'[1]

Also all the translations of Tyndale were to be burned and all Bibles which had his annotations or preambles; the singing or reciting of rhymes contrary to the doctrine of the Six Articles was forbidden. According to Gairdner, the liberty granted by the king to his subjects to read the Bible, had been "so much abused by a great multitude of them, especially 'of the lower sort'"[2] that its use was restricted to the nobility or householder who

> 'may read or cause to be read, by any of his family, servants in his house, orchard, or garden, to his own family, any text of the Bible; and also every merchantman, being a householder, and any other persons, other than women, apprentices, &c., might read to themselves privately the Bible. But no woman, except noblewomen and gentlewomen, might read to themselves alone, and no artificers, apprentices, journeymen, servingmen of the degrees of yoemen, husbandmen or labourers, were to read the New Testament to themselves or to others, privately or openly, on pain of one month's imprisonment! '[3]

Robinson quotes a pathetic testimony of what this denial of the free Bible meant to the common people; on the flyleaf of a copy of Polydare Vergil's History of Inventions are these words:

> 'When I kepe Mr. Letymers shepe I bout thys boke when the Testament was oberragated, that shepeherdys myght not rede hit.

1. Ut per Gairdner, Lollardry, vol. II, p. 301.
2. Gairdner, Lollardry, vol. II, p. 302.
3. Ut per Robinson, op. cit., pp. 179-180.

> I pray God amende that blindness. Wryt by Robert Wyllyams, keppying shepe vpon Seynbury hill. 1546.'[1]

In that same year "A Supplication of the Poor Commons" voiced the disappointment in sterner terms; appealing to the king against those who had stopped the reformation, the writer said:

> 'They cannot abide this name, the Word of God; but they would have the scriptures called, the Commandments of God. They have procured a law, that none shall be so hardy to have the scripture in his house, unless he may spend £ 10 by year. . . . Hath God put immortal souls in none other, but such as be possessions of this world? Did not Christ send word to John the Baptist, that the poor received the gospel? -- Why do these men disable them from reading of the scriptures, that are not endued with the possessions of this world? . . . They are like to a curr dog lying in a cock of hay: for he will eat none of the hay himself, nor suffer any other beast that comes to eat thereof.'[2]

Complaint was made that in many churches the Bible had been placed in such places where the poor "durst not presume to come," and condemnation was made of those who held "Latin lies, and conjuring of water and salt" to be the service of God, rather than the study of His most holy word.[3] In his account of the Windsor martyrs, Foxe relates that when Master Ely began to rail against laymen, who took upon them to meddle with the Scriptures, Robert Testwood replied: "'Master Ely, by your patience, I think it be no hurt for laymen, as I am, to read and to know the Scriptures.'" Ely asked him to explain what St. Paul meant when he said, "'If thine enemy hunger, feed him . . . and, in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head.'" Testwood explained: "'Marry, sir, he meaneth nothing else by them (as I have learned) but burning charity, that, with doing

1. As quoted by Robinson, op. cit., p. 180.
2. Ut per Strype, Memorials, vol. I, p. 635.
3. Ibid., pp. 635-636.

good to our enemies, we should thereby win them.'" "'Ah, sirra,'" quoth Ely, "'you are an old scholar indeed.'"[1]

There were many opportunities for the "old scholars" to put such a lesson into practice. At Filmer's trial his own brother, "a very poor labouring man," told that one Sunday Filmer ridiculed his going to church and said of the mass:

> 'If that be God, I have eaten twenty Gods in my days. Turn again, fool, and go home with me, and I will read thee a chapter out of the Bible, that shall be better than all that hou shalt see or here there.'[2]

When Marbeck told how he had been so desirous of a Bible that he had copied the five books of Moses and how, without much learning and skill, he had worked out a concordance of the Bible, the Bishop of Winchester only threatened and abused him:

> 'Marbeck! wilt thou cast away thyself? . . . What a devil made thee to meddle with the Scriptures? Thy vocation was another way, wherein thou hast a goodly gift, if thou didst esteem it.' Marbeck replied: 'Yes, my lord, I do esteem it; and have done my part therein, according to that little knowledge that God hath given me.' The bishop, unfolding a roll, said: 'Ah, sirra, the nest of you is broken, I trow. . . . Behold, here be your captains, both Hobby and Haynes, with all the whole pack of thy sect about Windsor, and yet wilt thou utter none of them.' Marbeck replied that these had only done him good and that he knew nothing against them, 'unless it be that the reading of the New Testament, which is common to all men, be an offence.' Later the bishop had to admit: 'there is a marvellous sect of them, for the devil cannot make one of them to betray another.'[3]

Anne Askew also kept her secrets. Although of a good family and favored in the queen's court, she was accused of leaving her husband for "gadding to gospel and gossip it at court."[4] When she was blamed

1. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, pp. 495-496.
2. Ibid., pp. 488-489.
3. This is a condensation. Vide Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, pp. 478-480 for more details of the interviews and trials.
4. Parsons ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 114.

for uttering the Scriptures and reminded that St. Paul forbade women to speak or to talk of the word of God, she answered that she knew that a woman ought not to speak in the congregation by the way of teaching, and then asked of the bishop's chancellor how many women he had seen go into the pulpit and preach. When he said he had never seen any, she replied that then "he ought to find no fault in poor women, except they had offended the law."[1] She was urged to reveal those she knew of her sect.

> 'My answer was, that I knew none. Then they asked me of my lady of Suffolk, my lady of Sussex, my lady of Hertford, my lady Denny, and my lady Fitzwilliam. To whom I answered, if I should pronounce any thing against them, that I were not able to prove it.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> 'Then they did put me on the rack, because I confessed no ladies or gentlewomen to be of my opinion, and thereon they kept me a long time; and because I lay still, and did not cry, my lord chancellor and Master Rich took pains to rack me with their own hands, till I was nigh dead.'[2]

So great were her tortures that when they brought her to Smithfield to be burned, she had to be carried in a chair. With her were burned (1546) three men, Nicholas Belevian (a priest), John Lascelles (a gentleman of the household of king Henry VIII), and John Adams (a poor tailor); as Fuller says: "three couple of qualities meeting together in four persons; clergy and laity, male and female, gentle and simple, made the fuel of the same fire."[3]

These and others died as a result of Henry's efforts to stamp out diversities of opinions. The persecutors looked for nests or groups of people who shared common beliefs; they suspected all who

1. Ut per Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, p. 538.
2. Ibid., p. 547.
3. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 115.

knew and read the Scriptures. How far they were right in thinking there were 'sects' with regular teachers or preachers of the Bible, we cannot tell. Did Anne Askew and Marbeck really know of such groups, or had they come to their views by their own reading or chance acquaintances? Surely there would be great caution among those who held such dangerous beliefs, and they doubtless realized that torture and death were easier than the disgrace and despair in betraying friends. It would appear that either their secrets were well kept and thus knowledge of them lost to us, or that with the Bible more accessible there was no need of fugitive readings and secret meetings. However, we can see John Porter, soldier Torner and Robert Testwood as representatives of all those who, in their day, without license or ecclesiastical sanction, read the Word of God to others and interpreted its meaning as they understood it.

When his hand dropped lifelessly into that of Archbishop Cranmer on the morning of January 28, 1547, Henry VIII bequeathed to his nine-year old son a nation which was separated from Rome but which was hardly "Protestant";[1] the progress of the Reformation had been checked by such legislation as the Six Articles Act and by the leadership of such men as Gardiner and Bonner. However, with the coronation of Edward VI in February (1547), the reformation-party resumed the leadership, and in Fuller's quaint words, "a peaceable dew refreshed God's inheritance in England, formerly parched with

1. Vide G. Constant, The Reformation in England, trans. E. I. Watkin (London: Sheed & Ward, 1941), 15-21.

persecution."[1] Latimer and others were released from their prisons, and the religious exiles returned, with many foreign theologians following them until it seemed to some that England became 'the harbour of all infidelity.' However, as Pollard says, it was "an indigenous heresy" which now burst into flames; the smoldering embers of Lollard teachings had been fanned by the new learning and the continental Reformation until at last it blazed forth, first into the Anglican reformation and later into the Puritan revolt. Pollard says:

> Wycliffe had outlined the principal features of the Anglican reformation, its appeal from the pope to the Scriptures, its call to the state to reform a corrupted church, its revolt against clerical wealth and privilege, its rejection of the mass. The difference between his design and the Anglican realisation is the limitation of the latter; and the painted glass of the Anglican church intercepted some of the puritan rays of the morning star of the reformation.[2]

Assisted by Thomas Cromwell under Henry and by Somerset and Warwick under Edward, Archbishop Cranmer, as the leader of the Reformation party, sought both to make the church Protestant and to obtain uniformity throughout the land; as Clark says, "the first intention required that there should not be too little reform, while the second required that there should not be too much."[3]

No time was lost in resuming the progress of the Reformation; in Edward's first Parliament, the statute of the Six Articles was

1. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 303.
2. A. F. Pollard, History of England: From the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (vol. VI of The Political History of England, ed. William Hunt, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910), 22. Vide also p. 21.
3. Henry W. Clark, History of Nonconformity, (2 vols., London: Chapman & Hall, 1911), I, 130-131.

repealed as were many of the treason laws, including two statutes against the Lollards; there was an authorization for administering 'the sacrament of the Lord's supper' in both kinds and a prohibition of private masses. Instructions, thirty-six in number, were given to a commission for such changes as the removal of images which elicited superstitious worship and the placing of a large English Bible, with Erasmus' Paraphrase on the Gospels, in a place within all of the churches which would be convenient for the people to read therein; also the bishops were required to preach at least once a quarter and to give licences only to those who were able to preach.[1] Cranmer prepared a Book of Homilies, "to be read by such priests as could not preach" so that "the poor people might have some means of instruction,"[2] and a copy of these homilies was left with every parish priest by the visiting commissioners. Burnet says that the homilies were designed to lead the people away from looking to the priest for some secret trick of saving their souls and at the same time to guard against the other extreme of "some corrupt gospellers, who thought, if they magnified Christ much, and depended on his merits and intercession, they could not perish, which way soever they led their lives."[3] These printed sermons were not always welcomed; Strype says:

> . . . sometimes when they were read in the church, if the parishioners liked them not, there would be such talking and babbling in the church, that nothing could be heard. And if the parish were better affected, and the priest not so, then he would 'so hauk it, and chop it, (I use the words of old Latimer,) that it were as good for them to be without it,

1. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 304-307.
2. Strype, Memorials, vol. II, p. 48.
3. Burnet, Hist. of Reform. vol. II, p. 43.

> for any word that could be understood.' But some priests would indeed read them very well.[1]

In the sermon "Against Strife and Contention about matters of religion" we get a picture of the tension of the time:

> 'Too many there be, which upon the ale-benches or other places, delight to set forth certain questions, not so much pretaining to edification, as to vain-glory, and shewing forth of their cunning; and so unsoberly to reason and dispute, that when neither part will give place to other, they fall to chiding and contention, and sometime from hot words to further inconvenience.'[2]

The homilist gives some examples of the taunts which were common in those days: 'He is a pharisee, he is a gospeller, he is of the new sort, he is of the old faith, he is a new-broached brother, he is a good catholic father, he is a papist, he is an heretic.'[3]

However, the quarrels upon the ale-bench and the bitter words within the church continued; Trevelyan says that as soon as the heavy hand of Henry's government was raised,

> the religious parties everywhere flew at one another's throats. 'Hot gospellers' matched against 'suppressed' monks and friars led on the rival crowds. Brawling in church and street over the removal or the non-removal of images, . . . Protestant preaching or Catholic processions, seemed the prelude to civil war.[4]

According to Fuller, certain popish preachers told "scandalous reports" against the king, such as he intended to demand half-a-crown apiece of every one who should be married, christened, or buried; to prevent such tales as would cause trouble, the king issued a proclamation (February 6, 1548) that "none should preach except licensed under the

1. Strype, Memorials, vol. II, p. 49.
2. Ut per Charles Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion (London: F. &. J. Rivington, 1851), 41.
3. Ibid.
4. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl. pp. 314-315. Vide Constant, Reformation, pp. 55-56.

seals of the Lord Protector or archbishop of Canterbury."[1] Thus began "the restraint of preaching which was so remarkable a feature of an age of liberty" and the revival of the old system of licenses[2] which restricted all preaching to the bishops and those whom they or the king's agents had licensed. Those who received license to preach were admonished to inform the people that they were not 'to take their own way in religion, nor to run, before their heads have appointed them what to do;' neither were the licensed preachers to stir the people to any alteration not already authorized in the Injunctions, Homilies and Proclamations; the salutary admonition which accompanied the licenses declared:

> 'It is far more necessary at this time to exhort men to mend their lives, to keep the commandments, to be humble to their rulers. You may indeed teach them to flee from the old superstitions, the pardons, beads, pilgrimages, and the rest of the Bishop of Rome's traditions; but not to run before they be sent, or change things without authority. It is neither the duty of a private man to alter ceremonies and innovate orders in the Church, nor the part of a preacher to bring into contempt what the prince allows. Look at the Acts of Parliament, the Injunctions, the Proclamations, the Homilies; and keep to them.'[3]

Nevertheless, the struggle between the two orders continued; Thomas Hancock, a licensed preacher, tells that after preaching in Twynham, when the vicar was at the Mass

> 'I told the people that what he held over his head they could see, but that Christ had said that we should see Him no more: that therefore to bow to it, to kneel to it, to honour it as God, was to make it an idol, and to commit horrible idolatry. And the vicar was angry, and rebuked me, and went out of the church. . . . Then I went to the godly town of Poole in Dorset, where they were first called Protestants in that part of

1. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 314.
2. Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England (6 vols., London: George Routledge & Sons, 1881), II, 419.
3. Edward Cardwell, Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England, (new ed., 2 vols., Oxford: University Press, 1844), I, 63.

> England: and I became minister of Poole. And in preaching there I said again that what the priest held over his head was not God. And a great merchant in the place said that I came from the Devil, and bade the people from me. And another man called out that it should be God, when I was a knave. And after that, they came about me in the church, and asked me to say a Dirige for all souls: and when I said, not with my life, they becalled me and my wife (I had a wife) and set upon me in the quire, so that I had much ado to get out. . . .'[1]

Finally, on September 23, 1548, all preaching was prohibited by a proclamation:

> '. . . his Highness, minding to see very shortly one uniform order throughout this his realm, and to put an end to all controversies in religion, so far as God shall give grace, (for which cause, at this time, certain bishops and notable learned men, by his Highness's commandment are congregate,) hath by the advice aforesaid thought good, . . . to inhibit, . . . all manner of persons whosoever they be, to preach in open audience in the pulpit or otherwise, by any sought colour or fraud, to the disobeying of this commandment, to the intent that the whole clergy, in this mean space might apply themselves to prayer to Almighty God, for the better achieving of the same most godly intent and purpose. . . .'[2]

Fuller explains that this came at the time when many popish pulpits sounded the alarm of Ket's rebellion and the Devonshire commotion; "besides," he adds, "this prohibition of preaching lasted but for few weeks."[3]

In the meanwhile the Windsor Commission worked on the 'one uniform order,' which came forth as the first Book of Common Prayer and was approved by Parliament in 1549. Although its prayers were copied after ancient usage, this English service-book gave parts of the service to the people so that the service became "a partnership between minister and congregation rather than a service performed by

1. Ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 533-534.
2. Ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 315.
3. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 316.

the priest on the congregation's behalf."[1] In the preface, the principle of uniformity was declared: "instead of a confusing variety of local 'uses' there was henceforth to be but one use."[2] With the Prayer-book came the mildest of the Acts of Uniformity; no penalties were imposed on laymen who merely refused to attend the new service, but those who disturbed the service or encouraged priests to use other forms were subject to fines and imprisonment. Other than what was implied in the ritual and prayers, there was no standard of doctrinal uniformity. Nevertheless, Princess Mary refused to discontinue having the Mass said after the Roman usage; Bishop Gardiner remained in the Tower rather than conform, and Bonner was deprived. The up-risings[3] in the west counties were mainly directed against the social conditions, although there was some resentment against the new service. Somerset's sympathy with the rebelling villeins and his efforts to adjust the social ills resulted in his fall and in the rise of the harsher government of Warwick, who pushed the cause of the Reformation even further. The second prayer-book (1552) was much more Protestant than the first, and its law of uniformity was sterner. Cherishing the ideal of "the comprehension of all the reformed Churches in one general communion," Cranmer delayed any "domestic Formulary of Faith" until the hope of a general confession was finally abondoned;[4] in 1553 the Articles of Religion were promulgated, which sought to establish 'concord and quietness in

1. Clark, op. cit., vol. I, p. 132.
2. Percy Dearmer, "The Church of England and the Reformation," An Outline of Christianity, ed. Peak & Parsons (5 vols., London: The Waverly Book Co., n.d.), III, Ch. 5, 58.
3. Vide Pollard, Hist. of Engl., pp. 25-37 for an account of these disturbances.
4. Vide Hardwick, op. cit., pp. 77-79.

religion.' Similar to the Augsburg Confession in content, the Articles were designed, according to Hardwick, "both as a protest against the scholastic corruptions, and as a curb on the licentiousness of private speculation, which the removal of the ancient yoke had too frequently occasioned."[1] The twenty-fourth article[2] is based on the fourteenth article of the Augsburg Confession which simply states that no one ought to preach or administer the sacraments who is not lawfully called; Hardwick says that it "is manifestly levelled against the Anabaptist error, that every one who fancied himself called to the work of the ministry was bound to assume the office of a teacher in defiance of the authority of the Church."[3] The article states:

> 'It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers unto the Lord's vineyard.'[4]

Although there were great leaders and preachers as Cranmer, Latimer, Knox, Ridley and Hooper, the clergy at that time was, according to Strype, "generally very bad, from the bishops to the curates;" many times the people withheld their tithes, saying that their curate was ignorant, idle, lazy and wicked.[5] Burnet says that many of the old learning, seeing their gains and rewards go with the

1. Hardwick, op. cit., p. 90.
2. Later to become the twenty-third, when the Forty-two Articles were reduced to Thirty-nine under Elizabeth.
3. Hardwick, op. cit., p. 103, Vide also p. 28.
4. Ut per Tyrrell Green, The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation (London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1896), 164.
5. Strype, Memorials, vol. III, pp. 316, 318.

old ways, secretly hated all that they were forced to profess outwardly; others of the new learning discredited the Reformation by their conduct:

> The irregular and immoral lives of many of the professors of the gospel, gave their enemies great advantages to say, they run away from confession, penance, fasting, and prayers, only that they might be under no restraint, but indulge themselves in a licentious and dissolute course of life. By these things, that were but too visible to some of the more eminent among them, the people were much alienated from them: and as much as they were formerly prejudiced against popery, they grew to have kinder thoughts of it, and to look on all the changes that had been made, as designs to enrich some vicious courtiers; and to let in an inundation of vice and wickedness upon the nation. Some of the clergy that promoted the reformation, were not without very visible blemishes: some indiscretions, both in their marriages and in their behaviour, contributed not a little to raise a general aversion to them.[1]

Many who were free from these charges were not able or willing to preach. Although Trevelyan might say that Latimer "by his rough, homely sermons, set the standard of that English pulpit oratory which, together with the Bible and the Prayer Book, effected the conversion of the people to Protestantism,"[2] yet in 1551 Hooper reported from his visitation that in his diocese there were many clergymen who did not know even the Lord's Prayer, and in 1535 the archbishop of York said that in all his province there were not twelve ministers who were able to preach. Such a need had led to the publishing of the Homilies, which became a convenient and safe crutch for "the unpreaching prelates, lording loiters and idle ministers," whom Latimer denounced in his famous sermon, The Plough:

> '. . . since lording and loitering hath come up, preaching hath come down, contrary to the Apostles' time; for they preached and lorded not, and now they lord and preach not.'[3]

1. Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. III, p. 318.
2. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 313.
3. Edwin Charles Dargan, A History of Preaching (2 vols., New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1905) I, p. 371.

However, there were men who neither lorded nor loitered; among the humbler people, there were many Bible-readers who seriously undertook the reformation and went beyond their leaders in questioning everything which they could not find in the Scriptures. While such a development could easily have come from the Lollard teachings and the use of the English Bible, the excesses of the German Anabaptists created such a fear in the popular mind that all independent, divergent groups were likely to be called by that name. Thus the term, "Anabaptist" became one of derision which none would own and one used almost indiscriminately to slander the poorer class of people who differed from the official religion; like lollardry, it became synonymous with heresy but with far more social and political significance; to the popular mind, Anabaptism meant revolt, political and religious anarchy. As such an opinion exerted a great influence upon the course of events in England, we might be forgiven if we insert here Burnet's concise and fair statement of the German Anabaptists.

> Upon Luther's first preaching in Germany, there arose many, who, building on some of his principles, carried things much further than he did. The chief foundation he laid down was, that the Scripture was to be the only rule of Christians. Upon this many argued, that the mysteries of the Trinity, and Christ's incarnation and sufferings, of the fall of man, and the aids of grace, were indeed philosophical subtleties, and only pretended to be deduced from Scripture, as almost all opinions of religion were; and therefore they rejected them. Among these, the baptism of infants was one. They held that to be no baptism, and so were re-baptized: but from this, which was most taken notice of, as being a visible thing, they carried all the general name of anabaptists.
>
> Of these there were two sorts most remarkable. The one was, of those who only thought that baptism ought not to be given but to those who were of an age capable of instruction, and who did earnestly desire it. This opinion they grounded on the silence of the New Testament about the baptism of children: they observed,

> that our Saviour, commanding the apostles to baptize, did join teaching with it; and they said, the great decay of Christianity flowed from this way of making children Christians before they understood what they did. These were called the gentle, or moderate anabaptists.
>
> But others, who carried that name, denied almost all the principles of the Christian doctrine, and were men of fierce and barbarous tempers. They had broke out into a general revolt over Germany, and raised the war called the rustic war: And possessing themselves of Munster, made one of their teachers, John of Leyden, their king, under the title of the King of the New Jerusalem. Some of them set up a fantastical, unintellibible way of talking of religion, which they turned all into allegories: these being joined in the common name of anabaptists with the other, brought them also under an ill character.[1]

Shortly after the break with Rome, "a host of misbelievers known by the general name of 'Anabaptists'"[2] sought refuge in England, but during Henry's reign they were burned, deported or suppressed; however, under the moderate government of Edward, they "rose into a considerate body, beginning 'to look abroad and to disperse their dotages.'"[3] Undoubtedly they found "sympathizers among those in whose minds the teachings of the Lollards still lingered"[4] and exerted influence on other groups of Bible-readers; so that there resulted societies which Knappen calls "semi-Anabaptists" or "halfway Anabaptist."[5] In April of 1549 complaint was made to the Council that "the strangers that were come into England . . . were disseminating their errors, and making proselytes," so that a commission was ordered "to examine and to search after all anabaptists, heretics, or

1. Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. II, p. 178.
2. Hardwick, op. cit., pp. 40-41.
3. Ibid., p. 94.
4. A. C. Underwood, History of the English Baptists (London: Kingsgate Press, 1947), 26-27. Vide, Hardwick, op. cit., p. 42.
5. M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: University Press 1939), 150-151, passim.

contemners of the Common Prayer."[1] Writing to Bullinger in June of 1549, Hooper says:

> 'The Anabaptists flock to the place [i.e. of his lecture], and give me much trouble with their opinions respecting the Incarnation of our Lord; . . . Alas! not only are these heresies reviving among us . . . but new ones are springing up every day. There are such libertines and wretches who are daring enough in their conventicles, not only to deny that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, but also to call that blessed Seed a mischievous fellow, and deceiver of the world.'[2]

Some tradesmen of London were called before the commission and were persuaded to abjure such opinions as:

> 'That a man regenerate could not sin; . . . that there was no Trinity of persons; . . . that all we had by Christ was, that he taught us the way to heaven; that he took no flesh of the Virgin; and that baptism of infants was not profitable.'[3]

At least one of these tradesmen had to wear a faggot the following Sunday and to hear a sermon against his heresy at St. Paul's. Joan Bocher, commonly called Joan of Kent, was not so easily persuaded to recant; according to Parsons, she had been "a great disperser of Tindal's New Testament" and was "a great reader of scripture herself"; she was known to certain women of quality, and in the difficult days had tied the prohibited books under her skirts that she might more secretly disperse them in the court.[4] She expressed such a view of Christ's incarnation that it seemed she was denying His humanity, for which she was condemned and finally burned. About this same time (1550) attention was directed to certain "sectaries" in Essex and Kent, who "sheltering themselves under the profession of the gospel" had made, according to Strype, the first "separation from

1. Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. II, p. 178.
2. Hooper ut per Hardwick, op. cit., pp. 94-95.
3. Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. II, p. 178.
4. Parsons ut per Strype, Memorials, vol. II, p. 348.

the reformed church of England, having gathered congregations of their own."[1] From the documents[2] of their deposition which were made in the ecclesiastical court, we find striking similarities with the Bible-groups of Hacker and Pykas; these congregations are more advanced in their organization and they are "tainted" with Anabaptist views, but they easily could have developed from the earlier Bible-groups. However, we know only what was extracted from them, and therefore cannot substantiate any theory of their origin. The congregation in Essex met at Bocking and another one met in Feversham and in other places in Kent; there were contributions made among them for the better maintenance of their congregations, and the members from Kent went over to instruct and to join with those in Essex; Henry Hart, Cole of Feversham, George Brodebridge and Humphrey Middleton were named as their teachers.[3] John Grey reported that Cole of Feversham had affirmed that "'the doctrine of predestination was meeter for devils than for Christian men'" and that Harte had said that "'learned men were the cause of great errors.'" Laurentins Ramsaye said that Henry Harte affirmed that "'there is no man so chosen or predestinate but that he may condemn himself: Neither is there any so reprobate but that he may, if he would, keep the commandments and be salved.'" Willmus Forstall told that Henry Harte had said that "'his faith was not grounded upon learned men, for all errors were brought in by learned men;'" Cole of Maidstone was reported to have said that "'children were not born in original

1. Strype, Memorials, vol. II, p. 384.
2. Harleian MS. 421, folio 133, ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 207-210.
3. Vide Strype, Memorials, vol. II, p. 384.

sin.'" William Greenlande said "'to play at any game for money it is sin, and the work of the flesh:'" also he confessed "'the congregation and their meeting at divers places, and their going into Essex. And also that he hath contributed.'"[1] Among the entries which Dixon quotes from the Council Book, are the following:

> June 23, 1549 (50). 'Upon a letter from the L. Chancellor touching certain preachers in Essex that used preaching on the work-days, a Letter was directed to the Bp. of London, declaring the disposition of the people to idleness, and praying him therefore to take order for preaching the holidays only till a better time of the people's inclinations.'[2]

As there was no charge of heresy or sedition made against these who were accused only of having preaching on work-days, Strype supposes that the lord chancellor, Rich, "who was no favourer of the gospel," expressed fear that such practice might lead to the neglect of ordinary callings and to idleness, whereas "the truth was, he was afraid the knowledge of the gospel should spread too much."[3]

> Jan. 27, 1550 (51). 'Upchard of Boking was brought before the Council touching a certain assembly that had been made in his house in Christmas last: who confessed that (there) were certain Kentishmen to the town to have lodged with goodman Cooke: And because Cooke's wife was in childbed, they came to this Upchard's house, where Cooke was then at dinner, and by Cooke's entreaty there they were lodged. And upon the morrow, which was Sunday, divers of the town, about xii of the clock, came in: and there they fell in argument of things of the Scripture, especially whether it were necessary to stand or kneel bareheaded or covered at prayer, which at length was concluded in ceremony not to be material, but the heart before God was it that importeth, and nothing else. And because it seemes such an assembly, being of xl persons or moo, should mean some great matter, therefore both the said Upchard and one Simson of the same sort was committed to the Marshalsea till further trial was had: and order taken that letters should be sent both into Essex and Kent, for the apprehension of these that are accounted chief of that practice.'[4]

1. Ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 207-208, footnote.
2. Ibid., p. 209, footnote.
3. Strype, Memorials, vol. II, p. 385.
4. Ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 209-210, footnote.

The first three persons of those who were "assembled for Scripture matters in Bocking," which the Council examined were: John Barrett of Stampford, cowherd; Robert Cook of Bocking, clothier; John Eglisse of the same, clothier; fourteen others were also cited.[1]

> Feb. 3. 'This day Wm. Sibley and Thos. Young of Lenham, Nic. Sheterendem and Th. Sharpe of Pluckley, Cole of Maidstone, appeared before the Council, being of them that assembled at Bocking in Essex.
>
> 'Likewise vii others of Essex appeared the same day, both which being examined confessed the cause of their assembly to be for to talk of Scriptures. Not denying but they refused the Communion about ii years before upon very superstitious and erroneous purposes; with divers other evil opinions worthy of great punishment.'[2]

Five of these were "committed" and seven were bound in recognizance to appear, if they should be called upon and were "'to resort to their ordinary of resolution of their opinions in case they have any doubt in religion.'"[3] In speaking of these groups in Essex and Kent, Dixon says:

> In truth the great destitution of preaching, which the Reformation produced, was the main cause of the beginning of English dissent. Men, whether lay or clergy, having the gift, could not exercise it without licenses: and this rigour, maintained year after year amid the excesses of a revolution, bore the fruits that might be expected. Assemblies were held in spite of tyrannous prohibitions: wild teachers arose: the imperfect and uninstructed perusal of the Scriptures suggested a thousand fantastic questions, which were determined by the tumult of clothiers and cowherds.[4]

Burnet complains of another sort of people who began to make strange inferences from the doctrine of predestination,

> reckoning that since every thing was decreed, . . . men were to leave themselves to be carried by these decrees. This drew

1. Dixon, op. cit., vol. III, p. 210, footnote.
2. Ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. III, p. 210, footnote.
3. Ibid.
4. Dixon, op. cit., vol. III, p. 211.

some into great impiety of life, and others into desperation.[1] Strype gives us some examples of those whom he calls "religious cheats:" one Greg who once "counterfeited himself a prophet" was caught selling pots of strawberries half filled with fern; also a woman who pretended "signs and visions" was whipped and set on the pillory for attempting to poison her husband and for admitting her servant to her bed.[2]

There was yet another party which compromised Cranmer's ideal of uniformity and that party was neither separatist nor "cheats;" it was a party within the church which sought further reformation and which appealed to the Scripture for the standard of faith and practice as against the authority of custom and tradition. The objection was not against the idea of uniformity but rather against the contents of Cranmer's uniformity; they wanted uniformity without certain 'abuses.' It began in the protest against the vestments; John Hooper, sometimes called the father of nonconformity, published in 1550 a treatise opposing their use; his syllogism is as follows:

> Major Premise: All things to be required in the Christian Church are either ordained in the Bible or are things indifferent.
> Minor Premise: Vestments are neither ordained in the Bible for use in the Christian Church nor are they things indifferent.
> Conclusion: Therefore they are not to be required in the Christian Church.[3]

Also there came a protest against kneeling at communion and a quarrel over the position of the altar; these murmurings were to increase and grow louder until they thundered in civil storm and shattered England

1. Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. II, p. 182.
2. Strype, Memorials, vol. III, p. 148.
3. Ut per Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, Appendix I pp. 483-486. Vide Chapter IV, pp. 72-102.

into half a dozen denominations.[1] There are indications that Cranmer, Ridley and other leaders of what we might call the Anglican Reformation, wanted to make further changes and would have done so, if they had been able.[2] However, the death of the young king on July 6, 1553 ended all hope of further reformation for the time; and after Dudley's futile attempt to seat Lady Jane Grey on the throne, the struggle for a time became one of the survival of what had been done rather than an effort to do more.

1. Vide Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 335 for his famous description of this strife.

2. Daniel Neal, History of the Puritans (2 vols., London: printed for J. Buckland, 1754)I, 53. Here Neal quotes a passage which was left in the preface to one of their service-books: 'That they had gone as far as they could in reforming the church, considering the times they lived in, and hoped they that came after them would, as they might, do more.' Also Neal refers to a statement in King Edward's diary, in which the young king laments that "he could not restore the primitive discipline according to his heart's desire, because several of the bishops, some for age, some for ignorance, some for their ill name, and some out of love to popery, were unwilling to it."

CHAPTER THREE

THE RISE OF THE PURITAN LAY-PREACHER (1553-1602)

I. THE MARIAN PERSECUTION
   A. The Catholic reaction
   B. Persecution and its results
   C. Variations among the martyrs
   D. Irregular preachers
   E. The experiences of the exiles

II. THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT
   A. Elizabeth's policy of caution
   B. Parliamentary Statutes

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PURITANISM
   A. The vestment question
   B. Efforts toward uniformity
   C. The appeal to the Scriptures

IV. THE LACK OF PREACHING
   A. Conditions among the clergy
   B. Lay-readers and homilies
   C. The Puritan concept of preaching

V. PROPHESYING
   A. Early practices
   B. The queen's opposition
   C. Grindal's defense

VI. EARLY SEPARATISTS
   A. Independent "Puretans"
   B. English Presbyterian beginnings
   C. "Foreign sects"
   D. Robert Browne

VII. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT
   A. Division within Puritanism
   B. Barrowist prophesying
   C. Irregular preachers
   D. Persecution of Separatists

When the daughter of Catherine of Aragon came to London to claim the throne, (August 12, 1553), she declared, "That though her conscience was settled in matters of religion, yet she was resolved not to compel others, but by the preaching of the word."[1] However, when a tumult was caused by one of her preachers the next day in St. Paul's, Mary prohibited all preaching without special license and declared that her subjects were not to be compelled to be of her religion 'till public order should be taken in it by common assent;' in the meantime the names of papist and heretic were not to be used, and "if any made assemblies of the people, she would take care they should be severely punished."[2] Crowned the following October by Gardiner, who was now restored to his bishopric, Mary proceeded at once to have "Edward's laws about religion" repealed, and the Commons declared that there should be "no other form of divine service than what had been used in the last year of king Henry VIII."[3] Such changes were warnings of things to come, and many fled to the continent.[4] Trevelyan says that if Mary had been content to have stopped here at Henry's religious compromise, she might have won England, for the new religion had been made "odious and despicable" to many by the robbery of the guilds and chantries and "above all, [by] Northumberland's headlong career ending in treason and crowned with apostasy."[5] However, Mary was not willing to stay long by Henry's

1. Neal, op. cit., vol. I, p. 56.
2. Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, Part I, p. 383.
3. Neal, op. cit., vol. I, p. 58.
4. Neal says "above eight hundred", op. cit., vol. I, p. 58.
5. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 318.

compromise; and in pushing on she lost the love of her countrymen and the reconversion of her country to her faith. She first offended her subjects by marrying Philip of Spain; Commons protested against it and Wyatt's Rebellion was worded in its opposition. Her second offense came in the restoration of the papal supremacy, which at one time even Gardiner and Bonner had favored limiting; but aided by Cardinal Pole, Mary led the nation into confessing the sin of its schism and on November 30, 1554 was granted absolution. However in this submission, there was a kind of hypocrisy, obvious to the keen Venetian Michiele who reported:

> 'with the exception of a few most pious catholics, . . . all the rest make this show of recantation, yet do not effectually resume the catholic faith, and on the first opportunity would be more than ever ready and determined to return to the unrestrained life previously led by them.'[1]

There was little of a real counter-reformation, despite Pole's endeavors; and apart from the Queen and Pole, there was little of religious devotion and enthusiasm on the part of the Papal Party. Pollard says, "The reconciliation with Rome was the result not so much of popular impulse as of governmental pressure; and it stirred not a breath of spiritual fervour."[2] In the bargain made between the papacy and parliament, the issue of church property was omitted, while full authority in the affairs of faith and ecclesiastical government was returned to the papacy and the old Lollard and heresy laws were revived. This base compromise, Pollard says,

> protected property but not conscience from the attacks of the clerical courts. The sacrilegious harvest of the reformation was carefully sheltered; its spiritual and moral gleanings were exposed to the furious blasts of bigotry.3

1. Ut per Pollard, History, p. 131.
2. Pollard, History, p. 173.
3. Ibid., p. 134.

At a council, called to decide the best way of dealing with the heretics, Cardinal Pole favored a reformation of the clergy and the instruction and persuasion of the laity, but Gardiner's plan of terrifying the people into compliance by a few examples of severity gained the Queen's approval.[1] Rogers was the first to be burned; but rather than terrifying the people into compliance, his example of stedfastness became a model for those who followed him to the stake. Hooper's tortured death, during which he called to the people to bring more fire, was long remembered; Sanders embraced the stake, crying, 'Welcome the cross of Christ, welcome everlasting life.' Dr. Taylor followed, repeating the fifty-first Psalm and saying that as he had taught nothing but God's holy Word he was now to seal it with his blood. Crowds gathered to catch the last words of the martyrs and told and re-told their stories until they were gathered up and preserved by Foxe.[2] By February of 1555 Gardiner realized that a "few severe instances" had not produced the results he had expected and so left the whole affair to Bonner, who, according to Burnet, "undertook it cheerfully, being naturally savage and brutal, and retaining deep resentments for what had befallen himself in King Edward's time."[3] Weavers, fullers, linen-drapers and apprentices joined gentlemen, priests and bishops in testimony of their faith; a "very ancient fisherman" whose only crime was that he had sent his son to school that he might hear the Bible read by him, shared with

1. Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, pp. 467-469. Cf. Neal, op. cit., p. 64.
2. Vide Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VI, pp. 519-740 for detailed accounts.
3. Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 475.

the most learned preachers in dying amid the flames; strong youths perished with the old, the lame and the blind. At times the martyrs were so cheerful that it seemed more like a wedding than a burning; Bradford cheered the nineteen-year-old apprentice who was dying with him by reminding him that they would sup with Christ that night; Latimer's words became immortal—

> Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man. We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out.[1]

After publicly confessing that he had signed a recantation out of fear of death, Archbishop Cranmer came weeping to the stake and stretched out his right hand to be burned first, often crying, 'That unworthy Hand!' Neal describes "the whole year 1556" as "one continued persecution;" Bonner, not content to burn them singly, sent them to their deaths by companies.[2] Stories were told of extra torture and cruelty, such as snatching out an old man's beard by the roots and putting pitch over another's head at the stake; from the isle of Guernsey came the story of a woman's being delivered of a child in the flames and of the baby's being taken from her only to be thrown back into the fire. Burnet says that "the whole nation stood amazed at these proceedings, . . . [that] such barbarous cruelties must be executed on innocent men, only for their opinions."[3] In vain a petition from overseas warned the Queen of being carried away by a blind zeal in persecuting the members of Christ, and that "she was

1. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VII, p. 550. Vide pp. 547-552.
2. Neal, op. cit., p. 67.
3. Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 475.

trusted by God with the sword, for the protection of her people . . . and was to answer to him for their blood."[1] Philip sought to escape the blame of these cruelties, and the bishops, unashamedly, passed the responsibility onto the Queen.[2] By these cruelties the old religion came to appear as "a foreign creed, unpatriotic, restless and cruel, an impression more easily made than eradicated."[3] Burnet says that those who had favored the Reformation were awakened to have more serious thoughts about it when they saw so many die rather than deny it; "the rest of the nation, that neither knew nor valued religion much, yet were startled at the severity and strangeness of these proceedings."[4] Whatever their exact number[5] might have been, there can be no doubt but that the suffering of these martyrs became an important factor in making England Protestant; men died rather than submit to Rome, and in their deaths the Church of England arose.

However, all those who died were not of the same religious beliefs; although Ridley and Hooper were reconciled before their deaths, the imprisonment of others revealed other variations. Some were found in the King's Bench Prison who denied absolute predestination

1. Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 479.
2. Neal, op. cit., pp. 65-66. Vide Pollard, History, p. 156.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 319.
4. Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 477.
5. Foxe gives 275 as the number of those burned, with nine others who died in prison; Strype puts the number at 282; Thomas Brice's Register (1559) counts 284; Cecil, late in Elizabeth's reign, puts the number as high as 400; Neal says "no less than 277 persons, of whom were five bishops, 21 clergymen, 8 gentlemen, 84 tradesmen, 100 husbandmen, labourers and servants, 55 women, and four children." (Neal, op. cit., p. 68). Pollard says, "There can be no reasonable doubt that the number of those who were burnt for religious opinion under Mary fell very little, if at all, short of 300," most of whom died in London, Essex, East Anglia, the south-east midlands, Kent, and Sussex. (Pollard, History, pp. 154-155).

and original sin; Neal says,

> they were men of strict and holy lives . . .[who] ran their notions as high as the warmest Arminians, or a Pelagius himself, despising learning, and utterly rejecting the authorities of the fathers.

Bradford tried to win them to his own opinions; Philpot in answering Mr. Careless' report of them, expressed his regrets upon hearing of the contentions which these "schismaticks" had raised, and urged Careless not to cease to do "his endeavours in defence of the truth, against these arrogant, self-willed, and blinded scatterers," concluding with the reminder that these sects were "necessary for the trial of our faith."[1] There were others who disbelieved the divinity of Christ, two of whom raised "such unseemly and quarrelsome disputes" in the King's Bench that the marshal found it necessary to separate them from the other prisoners; there were also some who denied infant baptism.[2] Dixon says:

> It cannot be questioned that the tendency to secession or separation from the Church of England, apart from all variation of doctrine among the reformed, received a powerful impulse in Mary's time, merely from this, that nearly all the learned clergy were put to death, or driven into exile.[3]

Strype says that "there were now abundance of sects and dangerous doctrines, whose maintainers shrouded themselves under the professors of the gospel."[4] Against these, "A Confession and Protestation of the

1. Neal, op. cit., pp. 68-69. "The names of their teachers were Harry Hart, Trew, and Abingdon."
2. Ibid., p. 70. Cf. Dixon, op. cit., vol. IV, pp. 302-303. Whereas Neal was ignorant of any Freewiller who died at the stake, Dixon identifies Shetterden, Chamberlain, Kempe and Gibson as being of that opinion.
3. Dixon, op. cit., pp. 302-304.
4. Strype, Memorials, vol. V, pp. 116-117.

Christian Faith" was written by one John Clement, whom Strype judges to have been

> one of that sort of laymen, that, in the private assemblies of the professors, in these hard times, did perform the office of minister among them; for when the learned preachers and ministers were most of them burnt or fled (as they were by the middle of this reign), and the flocks left destitute of their faithful pastors, some of the laity, tradesmen, or others, endued with parts and some learning, used, in that distress, to read the scriptures to the rest in their meetings, and the letters of the martyrs and prisoners, and other good books; also to pray with them, and exhort them to stand fast, and to comfort and establish them in the confession of Christ to the death. Such an one was that excellent, pious man and confessor, John Careless, who was a weaver, of Coventry, and this Clement a wheelwright; who, in his epistle, styles himself, an unprofitable servant of the Lord: and, speaking of the warnings of the preachers that were then dead, and had confirmed their sayings with their blood, saith thus of himself: 'I myself, when I was with you, did, with my simple learning and knowledge, the best I could, to call you from those things that will surely bring the wrath of God upon you, except ye repent in time, and turn to the Lord with your whole heart; but how the preachers' warnings, and my poor admonitions, have been, and be regarded, God and you do know.'[1]

In reply to Feckenham's charge that among the sixteen "heretics" imprisoned at Stratford Bow there were sixteen different opinions, the "heretics" signed a declaration of their faith and published it abroad; likewise, other proclamations were made by various groups of prisoners who were charged with being Arians, Anabaptists and such.[2] Of the secret assemblies, or congregations or 'conventicles' which may be traced in the annals of Mary's reign, Dixon says, "it is probable that most of them were held for the purpose of hearing the English service read . . . , and not for sectarian or separatist worship."[3]

Whatever might have been their form of worship or variety of

1. Strype, Memorials, vol. V, p. 118. Both Clement and Careless died while awaiting execution and were buried in a dung-hill behind the prison.
2. Ibid., pp. 119-120.
3. Dixon, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 607.

theology, many of the fugitive preachers of this period assumed the character of the long-despised Lollard preacher or persecuted Bible teacher and forecast the form of the Puritan lay-preacher. Such a one was George Eagles, a tailor by trade, who was called "Trudge", "Trudgeover" or "Trudge-over-the-World" because of "his extraordinary and continual travels about from place to place, to exhort and confirm the brethern." Hearing of him, the council sent orders to waylay him, and a reward of twenty pounds was offered in Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk and Kent for him; but he and his company hid themselves in privy closets and barns, in holes and thickets, in fields and woods. At length he was taken in a field, not far from Colchester, and condemned on the charge of treason for having assembled more than six together; he was also accused of having prayed in his meetings for God 'to change the Queen's heart, or soon to take her away.' He was condemned, cruelly hanged, drawn and quartered and his four quarters were set up in Colchester, Harwick, St. Osiths and Chelmsford.[1] Strype relates another story of one John Rough, who as a young man had been a black friar in Sterling and who, upon his conversion, had been sent by Somerset to Carlisle, Berwick and Newcastle as a preacher of the reformation; in Queen Mary's time he and his wife had fled to Freezland where they lived by knitting; "it so fell out" that he, coming into England for yarn in October 1557, became minister to the congregation of gospellers at London, among whom he celebrated the communion by King Edward's Book. At one of their meetings, he was taken, condemned and later (Dec. 12, 1557) burned; writing to the congregation a little while before his death, he bade them to look up with their

1. Strype, Memorials, vol. V, pp. 177-178.

eyes of hope, for the redemption was not far off, 'but my wickedness . . . hath deserved that I shall not see it.'[1] However, others sought to save themselves by "artifically concealing and keeping their opinions to themselves; and by an outward conformity to the present superstitions, errors and corruptions."[2] Neal says that many went to Mass "to preserve their lives, and yet frequented the assemblies of the gospellers, holding it not unlawful to be present with their bodies at the service of the mass, as long as their spirits did not consent."[3]

Many continued to leave the country for the continent, but they also had their divisions and differences; as Fuller says, that which was conceived in the days of Edward was born among the exiles at Frankfort,[4] and the argument between Hooper and Ridley was resumed, with variations and elaborations. Invited to share a church-building with a French congregation on the condition that they should subscribe to the French confession of faith and not quarrel about ceremonies, a group of English exiles agreed "not to answer aloud after the minister, nor to use the litany and surplice" and to use the following order: a general confession of sins, a psalm sung in a plain tune, a prayer by the minister, the sermon, a prayer for all estates and particularly for England with the people joining in the Lord's Prayer, a rehearsal of the articles of belief, another psalm and the minister's blessing. Having chosen a minister and deacons, they sent invitations to other

1. Strype, Memorials, vol. V, p. 179. For the story of this congregation and the heroic suffering of Simpson rather than to divulge the names of its members, vide Ibid., pp. 287-288. Also Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 570.
2. Ibid., p. 187.
3. Neal, op. cit., p. 70. Vide Strype, Memorials, vol. IV, pp. 431-434.
4. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 329.

English exiles to come to Frankfort where "they might hear God's word truly preached, the sacraments rightly administer'd, and scripture discipline used, which in their own country could not be obtained."[1] Their boast that their settlement was nearer the order of scripture than the service book of king Edward offended many of the English exiles who exhorted them to conform to the exact pattern of king Edward's book:

> 'Should they deviate from it at this time, they apprehend they should seem to condemn those who were now sealing it with their blood, and give occasion to their adversaries to charge them with inconstancy.'[2]

The Frankfort congregation replied that they had omitted as few ceremonies as possible, that they apprehended that the martyrs in England were not dying in defence of ceremonies, which they allow may be altered and that there was no difference in doctrine;

> 'therefore if the learned divines of Strasburgh should come to Francfort with no other views, but to reduce the congregation to king Edward's form, and to establish the popish ceremonies, they gave them to understand that they had better stay away.'[3]

The signatures to this reply included those of John Knox, John Bale, John Foxe the martyrologist, with fourteen others; at their request Mr. John Calvin of Geneva wrote of the English liturgy:

> 'That there were many tolerable weaknesses in it, which because at first they could not be amended, were to be suffered; but that it behoved the learned, grave, and godly ministers of Christ, to enterprise farther, and to set up something more filed from rust, and purer. If religion had flourished till this day in England, many of these things should have been corrected. But since the reformation is overthrown, and a church is to be set up in another place, where you are at liberty to establish what order is most for edification, I cannot tell what they mean, who are so fond of the leavings of popish dregs.'[4]

1. Neal, op. cit., p. 72.
2. Ut per Neal, op. cit., p. 73.
3. Ibid., p. 74.
4. Calvin, as quoted by Neal, op. cit., p. 74.

However, in March of 1556, Dr. Cox, who had been tutor to Edward VI, went to Frankfort and disrupted the "purified" service and reinstituted the service of the prayer-book; supported by sixteen other English divines who had gathered for his support, Cox defeated Knox and his adherents who withdrew to Geneva where they published the order of service which they had used and which they defended as being 'in the judgment of Mr. Calvin and other learned divines, . . . most agreeable to scripture and the best reformed churches.' The reasons they gave for laying aside the rites and ceremonies of the prayer-book were: that they had been 'invented by men' and had been 'abused to superstition' and so should be abandoned, that men should content themselves with the wisdom that is contained in God's Book. Neal says that from this breach, or schism, among the English exiles came the distinction, by which the two parties were afterwards known, Puritans and Conformists.[1] We know of no lay preaching among the exiles; surely, there were times when laymen read the Bible to others and when groups read the prayers together, but we know of no instance when a layman undertook to preach. The exiles seemed well supplied with preachers, and neither Luther nor Calvin gave any encouragement for laymen to fulfill this part of the ministerial task. There was, of course, lay-preaching among the Anabaptists, but they had come into such disrepute that the exiles sought to avoid all contacts with them; there was still lay-preaching among the Waldensians, but the exiles had no contact with them, and Calvin was soon to cast his mantle over their valley also.

1. Neal, op. cit., p. 76. Vide Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, pp. 531-533; Strype, Memorials, vol. IV, pp. 420-427.

Whatever their differences might have been, the exiles were united in praying for England and in hungering for every rumor from the home-land. Every traveller must have caused tears as he told and re-told the stories of martyred friends; every report of the queen must have been eagerly received by those who waited. Mary had remained childless, and Philip had practically deserted her; the treasures of England had been exhausted in a meaningless struggle between Spain and France, and the people had become so dissatisfied with the government that 'they began to think heaven itself was against it.'[1] Rains swept across the land, and "a contagious distemper like a plague" claimed many; "the Queen's spirits decayed," and she became very weary and melancholy. Now, after nearly four hundred years, we can almost feel sorry for that poor, lonely, unloved woman, as she turned aside to die; for Cardinal Pole who died the same day (November 17, 1558), we can have more admiration with our pity.[2] However, on the day they died there seems to have been little grief for either, for

> 'all the churches in London did ring, and at night [men] did make bonfires and set tables in the street, and did eat and drink, and make merry for the new queen.'[3]

When Elizabeth was proclaimed Queen of England, everyone knew that there would be changes, but no one (not even the twenty-five year old daughter of King Henry) knew what those changes would be. By birth

1. Ut per Neal, op. cit., pp. 79-80.
2. Vide, Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, pp. 578-579. Strype, Memorials, vol. V, pp. 278-279.
3. Ut per Pollard, History, p. 175.

she almost had to be Protestant, but the safety of her throne and the stability of her dominion seemed more important to her than the domination of a creed. It was soon obvious that she, and not the pope, was to rule England, but she favored enough of the old to keep the papists from despairing. Her reign, unlike those of her brother and sister, was characterized by a certain elasticity which was a source of bewilderment to many of her contemporaries but which was an important element in making her reign one of the greatest in English history. Considering all the forces which were allied against her,[1] one cannot help marveling that she retained her throne at all, for when she came to power she was without friends, arms and money. She found strength in the English people whose love and loyalty she coveted and courted. Passing through the streets of London on her coronation day, she, with 'great sweetness in her looks,' looked out of her coach upon the people and returned their respects with a 'God bless you, my people;' she boasted that she was 'mere English' and owed nothing to foreigners; and when she was presented with a Bible, she kissed both of her hands and receiving it with great reverence embraced it and professed that she treasured it more highly than all the other magnificent gifts which that day had been given her.

Burnet says:

> Indeed this Queen had a strange art of insinuating herself by such ways into the affections of her people. Some said she was too theatrical in it; but it wrought her end; since by these little things in her deportment she gained more on their affections, than other princes have been able to do by more real and significant arts of grace and favour.[2]

1. Vide Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 589.
2. Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 594.

Count de Feria, the Spanish Ambassador wrote to Philip that

> 'this new Queen . . . is wedded to the people, thinks as they do, and treats foreigners slightingly. She is incomparably more feared than her sister was: she gives her orders and has her way as absolutely as her father had.'[1]

Nevertheless, Elizabeth proceeded very cautiously; the religious prisoners were released, and the exiles began to return only to be "'amazed to find the Pope's authority was not yet thrown off: masses were still said, and the bishops continued still insolent.'"[2] Elizabeth retained some members of Mary's council but added Sir William Cecil, Sir Nicholas Bacon and others who were of the reformed faith; she kept a crucifix in her chapel but forbade the priest to elevate the host. Such actions became typical of Elizabeth, of whom Jewel wrote, "'she is truly pious, but thought it necessary to proceed by law, and that it was dangerous to give way to a furious multitude.'"[3] However, neither gospeller nor papist was pleased, and both tried to win the support of the people. In his Annals of the Reformation, Strype says:

> . . . many of the gospellers, without authority, abhorring the superstitions and idolatry remaining in the churches, were guilty of great disorders in pulling down images and such other relics there. The others [the papists] spared not for lewd words poured out against the queen, without measure or modesty. And both took their occasions to speak freely their minds in the pulpits.[4]

In order to check these extremes and to restore universal charity and concord, Elizabeth, like Edward and Mary before her, prohibited all preaching "'until consultation may be had by Parliament, by her

1. Spanish Calendar, 1558, pp. 1-22., ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. V, p. 41.
2. Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr, dated March 20, 1559, ut per Burnet, Reformation, vol. III, p. 402.
3. Jewel ut per Burnet, Reformation, vol. III, p. 405.
4. John Strype, Annals of the Reformation (new ed., 4 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), I, 59.

Majesty and her three estates of this Realm;'"[1] she commanded that the services and ceremonies were, for the time being, to remain unaltered and that the Gospels, Epistles, the Ten Commandments, the Litany, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed were to be allowed in English, without any explanation or exposition. However, according to Lever, "'some of us preachers, who had returned from Germany,'" were not content to remain idle and so upon being requested to preach "'forthwith preached the Gospel in certain parish churches, to which a numerous audience eagerly flocked together.'"[2] Thomas Parrys was taken for assembling a congregation at Worcester-house in London; "for though these gospellers could not yet get the churches," says Strype, "yet, instead of them, they held congregations in other places, convenient for the capacity and largeness of them."[3] There was at least one occasion when the gospellers were not willing to leave the church to others and proceeded to take it for their own use; Dixon quotes the following account from the Venetian Calendar:

> 'On Christmas Day [1558] in the church of St. Augustine, assigned to the Italian nation, two individuals, whom I will not call preachers, for they were mechanics and cobblers, followed by a very great mob, entered by force, breaking the locks of the doors. Both of them leaped into the pulpit, and book in hand commenced reading and preaching to the people, one following the other, uttering a thousand ribaldries concerning the reign of Queen Mary of blessed memory and of Cardinal Pole, and vituperating the people for the errors they had committed in believing their former teachers. A fine metamorphosis, two rogues preaching at once in the same pulpit!'[4]

1. Henry Gee, The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion, 1558-1564 (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1898), 2. Also Dixon, op. cit., vol. V, p. 14.
2. Lever to Bullinger, August, 1559. Zurich Letters. II, 29 ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 17-18 footnote.
3. Strype, Annals, vol., I, pp. 59-60.
4. Ut per Dixon, op. cit., vol. V, p. 18 footnote.

Ignoring the Bishops' formal protest against any alteration in the existing religion, Elizabeth's first Parliament (January 25, 1559) began to undo what queen Mary had done by restoring to the crown "the ancient jurisdiction over the State ecclesiastical and spiritual," and by abolishing "all foreign power repugnant to the same."[1] This was followed by an Act for the uniformity of Common Prayer and Divine Service in the Church, and the administration of the Sacraments; other acts were passed, recovering the first-fruits and tenths, forbidding witchcraft and rebellious assemblies, granting the crown the right to examine the causes of spiritual persons' deprivation and annexing to the Crown the wealth of the religious houses established in queen Mary's reign. In May of 1559, Lord Bacon commended the House for what had been done toward establishing a uniformity in religion and warned against

> 'those that were too swift, as those that were too slow; those that went before the law, or behind the law, as those that would not follow. For good government could not be where obedience failed, and both these alike broke the rule of obedience.'[2]

The "slow" ones were the bishops who tried to delay the changes, but the House of Commons and the Crown carried the Reformation against their will and decided what "the one and only religion" of the land was to be.[3] The title of "supreme head of the Church" was modified to that of its "supreme governor," but there was no question that Elizabeth intended to rule the ecclesiastical affairs within her

1. Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, ed. G. W. Prothero (4th ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 1. Vide pp. 1-13.
2. Ut per Strype, Annals, vol., I, p. 100.
3. Trevelyan describes this settlement as "a lay revolution." Vide, Hist. of Engl., pp. 329-330.

dominion. For a time the Marian bishops and clergy refused to take the prescribed oath; Cox wrote to Weidner in May (1559) that "'the whole body remain unmoved.'"[1] However, when the royal visitation of all the dioceses began and the clergy were charged to submit to the Injunctions or suffer deprivation and excommunication, the situation began to change so that by Autumn the Spanish Ambassador admitted that "'Heresy is recovering furiously all the credit it had lost for years past.'"[2] The Injunctions and the Articles of Inquiry, which were copied from those of Edward's reign, included such familar points as the setting up of large Bibles and Erasmus' Paraphrase within the churches, with the admonition that "'no man shall talk or reason of the Holy Scripture rashly or contentiously, nor maintain any false doctrine or error;'"[3] each parson was required to preach or read a homily once a quarter and all preachers were to be licensed; objectionable images and shrines were to be removed and "'a comely and honest pulpit'" was to be set in a convenient place "'for the preaching of God's word;'" ministers were called upon to lead exemplary lives and to wear "'such seemly habits'" as were commonly worn in the latter years of the reign of King Edward VI; notorious sinners were to be barred from Holy Communion, and no one was to be permitted to disturb the preacher or minister in time of his sermon or any part of the divine service; neither was one to neglect his own parish church to resort to any other church in time of common prayer or preaching.[4]

1. Cox ut per Gee, op. cit., p. 41.
2. Aquila (Spanish Calendar 1559, p. 68), ut per Gee, op. cit., p. 46.
3. Gee, op. cit., pp. 55, 58 etc.
4. Ibid., pp. 55-62 passim.

These Injunctions with the Act of Supremacy and the Prayer Book, according to Gee, were "the three acknowledged bases of the settlement," and so continued until they were superseded in 1583 by the Thirty-nine Articles.[1] Most of the Marian clergy finally took the oath of supremacy, adopted the Prayer-Book and accepted the Injunctions; Gee says that while no exact number can be given, "it is impossible to conclude that many more than 200 were deprived;" the majority acquiesced, at least outwardly.[2] The Marian bishops gave the greatest trouble, but their places were taken by Grindal, Cox, Jewel, Parkhurst and others; Matthew Parker, in whose care Anne Boleyn had entrusted her little daughter, reluctantly accepted the summons of that daughter in 1558 to assist in the ecclesiastical affairs of the realm and was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in December of 1559.[3] Thus those who moved "too slowly" were probed into step or replaced, and the Romanist Party was stayed for a time; but there was also trouble with those who went "too fast" in the reformation, and to them we must now give our attention.

The argument over the vestments continued; in a letter to Peter Martyr (Nov. 5, 1559), Jewel said that he wished those "'relics of the Amorites,'" were "'extirpated to the very deepest roots.'"[4] However, the queen favored the clerical habit and upon her insistence Cox, Grindal, Jewel, Parkhurst, Bentham and others concluded that they

1. Gee, op. cit., p. 45.
2. Ibid., p. 251. Vide Ibid., pp. 217-247. Cf. Dixon, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 177-180.
3. For the endless arguments over this Consecration, vide Dixon, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 198-248.
4. Ut per Burnet, Reformation, vol. III, pp. 423-424.

they should not desert their ministry for such an "indifferent" matter and so accepted the vestments and rites in order to fill the vacancies within the church; Marsden says that they worded the issue into this question: "'We are brought into such straits, that since we cannot do what we would, shall we not do, in the Lord, what we can?'"[1] What they reluctantly accepted for their own use, they, with varying degrees of rigor, enforced upon others. However, some of the returning exiles would not compromise in accepting "the popish garments;" Miles Coverdale, the venerable translator, was not restored to his bishopric; John Knox, who had offended the queen with his writings against women-rulers, returned to his native Scotland; John Foxe, whose Acts and Monuments was becoming a tremendous force in converting England from Rome, pleasantly complained in 1561:

> 'I still wear the same clothes, and remain in the same sordid condition, that England received me in, when I first came home out of Germany, nor do I change my degree or order, which is that of the Mendicants; or if you will, of the "friars preachers."'[2]

The Convocation of 1562/3 voted down a petition, calling for further reforms such as the doing away with the use of copes and surplices and the sign of the cross at baptism; the thirty-three signers pleaded in vain that "'the punishment of those, who do not in all things conform to the publick order about ceremonies . . . be mitigated.'"[3] The Forty-two Articles were reduced to Thirty-nine, making the twenty-fourth Article of 1552, the twenty-third: the wording

1. J. B. Marsden, The History of the Early Puritans: From the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War in 1642 (London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1850), 33.
2. Ut per Neal, op. cit., p. 116.
3. Ibid., pp. 119-120.

of this prohibition against lay-preaching remains the same:

> 'It is not lawful for any man to take vpon hym the office of publique preachyng, or ministring the Sacramentes in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to iudge lawfully called and sent, whiche be chosen and called to this worke by men who haue publique aucthoritie geuen vnto them in the congregation, to call and sende ministers into the Lordes vineyarde.'[1]

The queen directed Archbishop Parker "'to take effectual methods, that an exact order and uniformity be maintained, in all external rites and ceremonies, as by law and good usages are provided for.'"[2] Although Parker might have preferred a toleration on the vestments and other debated points, he was resolved that the queen should be obeyed:[3] all preaching licenses were cancelled, and new ones were issued only to those who promised absolute conformity; otherwise, only the reading of homilies was permitted.[4] Many prominent clergymen were cited for refusing to conform; Humphrey had to leave Oxford, and Sampson was deprived; when John Foxe was called upon to subscribe, he took his Greek Testament out of his pocket, and said, 'To this I will subscribe;' in London, thirty-seven out of a hundred clergymen refused to subscribe and were suspended.[5] Many of the churches were closed for the lack of acceptable preachers, and those who were turned away "'travelled up and down the countries from church to church, preaching where they could get leave, as if they were apostles.'"[6] In London there were agitations on behalf of the suspended ministers, but the queen would

1. Ut per Hardwick, op. cit., pp. 294-295.
2. Ut per Neal, op. cit., p. 125.
3. Neal, op. cit., p. 128.
4. Ibid., pp. 135-136.
5. Ibid., pp. 136-141.
6. Jewel, ut per Neal, op. cit., p. 146.

not relax her insistence upon uniformity in these matters.[1] To bring the universities in line with her policy, Elizabeth made an official visit to Cambridge in 1564, at which time she described one of the disputants as 'unhewn and awkward;' but the name of Thomas Cartwright was not signed to the remonstrance, presented in 1565, against the "old popish habits," whereas the name of John Whitgift was.[2]

However, later Whitgift reversed his position and became Cartwright's relentless opponent, upholding the church's authority to adjust to the times and to evolve practices other than those stated in the Scriptures; Cartwright became the leader of those who maintained the absolute authority of the Bible, decrying ceremonies and offices which were not warranted in the Scripture.[3] To the delight of the Romanists, these disputes and events split the reformers into two parties, and the term "Puretan" seems to have come first into general usage about this time (1567/8).[4] As distinguished from those who conformed to the Church of England as established by law, whose practices and faith were mainly expressed in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles, the Puritans were those who sought "to purify the usages of the Established Church from taint of Popery, or to worship separately by forms so purified."[5] While it began as a movement within the church and at first showed no thought or desire to separate from it, Puritanism led directly to the separation of

1. Vide Pollard, History, p. 358.
2. Marsden, op. cit., p. 71.
3. Vide A. F. Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism 1535-1603 (Cambridge: University Press, 1925), 58-121.
4. M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 488. Cf. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 474-475.
5. George Macaulay Trevelyan, England Under the Stuarts (20th ed., London: Methuen & Co., 1947), 50.

those who could not "tarry" for the officials to reform the Church; and in them, Puritanism came to it fullest and most varied expression.[1] The Puritan began, with his conforming brother, in accepting the Bible as God's Revelation, but he went beyond him in holding that any tradition of faith or practice which conflicts with the Scriptures or which is not expressed in them should be abolished; to him the primacy of the Scriptures called for a return to the primitive Church as described in the New Testament, wherein also was set forth a pattern and guide for the details of life.[2] To William Perkins the Scriptures were

> of sufficient credit in and by themselves, needing not the testimony of any creature, not subject to the censure of either men or angels, binding the consciences of all men at all times, and being the only foundation of our faith and the rule and canon of all truth.[3]

This appeal to the Bible was one of the important factors in the rise of the Puritan lay-preacher; another factor was the contemporary condition of preaching.

As a result of the persecutions under Mary, there were few able preachers in the land; in 1560, Jewel complained that they were under a great want of preachers;[4] Thomas Lever wrote to Bullinger at Zurich that many parishes had no clergy and that out of the very small number of clergymen "'hardly one in a hundred . . . is both able and willing

1. Vide Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson, The Puritans (New York: American Book Co., 1938), 5-6.
2. Horton Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans (Westminster: dacre press, 1948), 15.
3. William Perkins, Workes (3 vols., London, 1618), I, 122.
4. Burnet, Reformation, vol. III, p. 432.

to preach the Word of God.'"[1] Grindal, Sandys and Jewel were fine preachers, but these few could not serve so great a need; very few of the Marian clergy who remained in the churches cared anything for preaching, and the queen's determination to have uniformity in ceremonies and vestments kept many willing Puritans from the pulpit. According to Frere, all the official documents of the church (1560-1563) show "a great lack of clergy, a number of vacant livings and ruinous churches, and an amount of absenteeism and other disorders which is very painful."[2] There were some itinerant preachers, but of these Strype says many were "ruffianly rakehells, nay common cozeners: by whose preaching the word of truth was become odious in the eyes of the people."[3] Frere says that in many places

> desolation reigned for want of clergy, and itinerant preachers were welcomed where the old parish priests were dead or fled; but of these there were only too few, and their task was heavy, since they had to combat not only the old-established views, but also 'a large and inauspicious crop of Arians, Anabaptists and other pests' which had sprung up like mushrooms.[4]

To meet this great need of clergy, Strype says that

> many lay-men and such as had followed secular callings, were ordained ministers: namely such as could read well, and were pious and of sober conversation, to serve in some of the parish churches for the present necessity.[5]

It might be well for us to hear the taunts of some of the Romanists and the answers of the reformers in regards to these new ministers, for in them both we shall hear notes which we have heard before and which we shall hear again. Speaking of Nowel, who had formerly been

1. Lever ut per Dargan, op. cit., vol. I, p. 477.
2. W. H. Frere, The English Church, in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625) (London: Macmillan & Co., 1924), 104.
3. Strype, Annals, vol. I, p. 269.
4. Frere, op. cit., p. 58.
5. Strype, Memorials, vol. V, p. 298.

master of Westminster in Edward's reign and was made Dean of St. Paul's upon his return from exile, Dorman says:

> 'That so soon upon his returning home, of a mean schoolmaster, became so valiant a preacher; unless perhaps the same spirit, that hath of late divines in their shops, and disputing upon the ale-bench for their degrees (so many tinkers, coblers, cow-herds, broom-men, fidlers, and such like) have also made him a preacher among the rest.'

To which Nowel gave this sober answer:

> 'None such reputed or counted divines among us, as you lyingly slander us. Indeed, your most cruel murthering of so many learned men, hath forced us, of meer necessity to supply some small cures with honest artificers, exercised in the scriptures; not in place of divines, bachelors or doctors, but instead of popish Sir John Lack-Latins, learning and all honesty; instead of Dr. Dicer, Bachelor Bench-whistler, and Master Card-player, the usual sciences of your popish priests; who continually disputed pro et contra for their form upon their ale-bench; where you should not miss of them in all towns and villages: instead of such chaplains of trust, more meet to be tinkers, cow-herds, yea, bear-wards and swine-herds, than ministers in Christ's church. That some honest artificers, who, instead of such popish books as dice and cards, have travailed in the scriptures.'[1] . . . 'and have succeded, is more against Mr. Dorman's stomach, than St. Paul's or St. Peter's either doctrine or example; who being artificers themselves, and in the highest place of Christ's church, using sometime their art, would not disdain other honest artificers to be in the meanest places.'[2]

Fuller says that the best that could be obtained was placed in the pastoral charges, that "a rush-candle seemed a torch where no brighter light was ever seen before."[3] However, Fuller admits that preaching ran very low, if it were true that Mr. Tavermour, a high-sheriff in Oxfordshire, came to St. Mary "in pure charity" and began a sermon with these words:

> 'Arriving at the mount of St. Mary's in the stony stage where I now stand, I have brought you some fine biscuits,

1. Ut per Strype, Memorials, pp. 298-299.
2. Ibid., Annals, vol. I, p. 266.
3. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 459.

> baked in the oven of charity, and carefully conserved for the chickens of the church, the sparrows of the Spirit, and the sweet swallows of salvation.'[1]

The re-issuing of Homilies was another part of the church's effort to supply the need of preachers; the twenty-seventh article of the Royal Injunctions of 1559 says:

> '. . . because through lack of preachers in many places of the [queen's] realms and dominions the people continue in ignorance and blindness, all parsons, vicars, and curates shall read in their churches every Sunday one of the Homilies, which are and shall be set forth for the same purpose by the [queen's] authority, in such sort, as they shall be appointed to do in the preface of the same.'[2]

The Elizabethan Homilies were twenty-one in number and patterned after those issued during Edward's reign; Fuller says:

> They are penned in a plain style, accommodated to the capacities of the hearers, (being loath to say, of the readers,) the ministers also being very simple in that age. Yet if they did little good, in this respect they did no harm. . . .[3]

Later (1580) Grindal was to remind the queen that the reading of the Homilies "'is nothing comparable to the office of preaching,' and that out of the lack of preaching the homilies had been devised 'that the people should not altogether be destitute of instruction.'"[4] Likewise the institution of Readers was considered a temporary means to supply the desolate parishes. Dixon suggests that the idea of having readers might have arisen from "the ordained lectors of primitive antiquity;"[5] Strype intimates that the appointing of readers was a modification of a suggestion made by John Rogers before his martyrdom that when the

1. Ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 459.
2. Ut per Gee, op. cit., p. 56.
3. Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 473.
4. Grindal, ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 12-13.
5. Dixon, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 194-195.

change of religion came, superintendents should be appointed over faithful readers in the parishes "so that the popish priests should be clean put out."[1] These laymen were ordained "only to read the service and the homilies to the people in the church, till others could be procured;" they were "only tolerated . . . to serve for the present necessity" in the hope that the universities in time might "produce men of learning to occupy places in the church;"[2] their appointment was certified by the bishop's letters and was subject to withdrawal. In 1561 the question of continuing the readers was reviewed, and in 1562 the readers had to subscribe to injunctions defining their position and work. While they were only authorized to read the service and the homilies and to catechize the children,

> some were inclined to go beyond this, and had to be restrained from preaching, interpreting, or, to use the later term, 'prophesying,' as well as from administering the sacraments, marrying or christening except in emergency.[3]

We can easily believe that many were unequal to this task and that many abuses came of this system, but there were many serious and able laymen who served well as readers and a few advanced into the regular clergy.[4]

To the Puritan, however, the homily-reader seemed a poor substitute for the prophet-preacher, and soon the term "dumb dogs" was revived to satirize the conforming Anglican who read "a homely homily" rather than preached "the living Word." The writers of the Admonition contrasted the ministers of the primitive Christian times with those

1. Strype, Annals, vol. I, pp. 266-267.
2. Ibid., pp. 234 & 267.
3. Frere, op. cit., p. 108.
4. Vide Strype, Annals, vol. I, pp. 267-268.

of their contemporaries:

> 'In the old Church the ministers were preachers, now bare readers. And if any be so well disposed to preach in their own charges, they may not without my Lord's licence.'[1]

The Puritan took his preaching seriously; it was not a mere recitation or oration, it was an earnest proclamation of salvation to dying men. Like St. Paul, the Puritan preacher was determined 'to know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified,' and his dominating desire was to win men for that Christ. As Davies says, the Puritan preacher

> could not afford to trick out his discourses with the flowers of rhetoric or scholarship. His aim was not to delight his hearers but to strike for a verdict in their souls. Therefore his preaching was Biblical, simple, prolonged, and its urgency was emphasized by the vehemence of his gestures.[2]

This type of "spiritual" preaching, which seems to have begun at Cambridge about the time of Cartwright's expulsion in 1571, was in marked contrast to the "witty" preaching of the more conservative churchmen.[3] The Word was all-important, and it was the preacher's task to spply that Word to the hearts and consciences of his hearers in such a way as to elicit an acceptance of it. Cartwright said: "'as the fire stirred giveth more heat, so the Word, as it were, blown by preaching, flameth more in the hearers than when it is read.'"[4] In advising his students to observe "an admirable plainnes and an admirable powerfulnesse" in their preaching, William Perkins said:

> It is thought good commendation before the world, when men say of a Preacher, surely this man hath showne himselfe a proper

1. As quoted by Davies, op. cit., p. 64.
2. Davies, op. cit., pp. 202-203.
3. Vide William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), 19 ff. For a detailed study of later developments, Vide W. Fraser Mitchell, English Pulpit Oratory, from Andrews to Tillotson (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932).
4. Cartwright ut per Davies, op. cit., p. 64.

> scholler, of good learning, good reading, strong memory, and good delivery, and so it is and such commendation (if iust) is not to be contemned: but that that cōmends a man to the Lord his God, & to his own cōscience, is when he preacheth so plainly to the capacitie and so powerfully to the conscience of a wicked man, as that hee thinkes doubtlesse God is within him.[1]

For Perkins and his fellow-Puritans the end of preaching was to save souls; to preach for any other reason was to dishonor God who gave the preacher this specific task:

> Some preach for <u>feare</u> of the law, to avoyd consure or punishment, some for <u>fashion</u> sake, that they may be like to others, some for <u>ostentation</u> sake, to win credite and prayse, some for <u>ambition</u>, to rise in the world: all these forget theyr cōmission, which is, <u>Deliver him from hell</u>.[2]

In 1584 and in 1596 two colleges were founded at Cambridge for the express purpose of training a preaching ministry; when quizzed by Elizabeth for erecting 'a Puritan foundation,' Sir Walter Mildmay replied: "'No, Madam, far be it from me to countenance any thing contrary to your established laws, but I have set an acorn, which when it becomes an oak, God alone knows what will be the fruit thereof.'"[3] However, there were many Puritans who were not inclined to wait to see what became of such; they were too busy setting acorns themselves. Their immediate answer to the problem of supplying able preachers was the exercise called "prophesying," which was another important factor in the rise of the Puritan lay-preacher.

The term <u>prophesying</u> was perhaps an unfortunate one, for it gave rise to the accusation that the Puritans were religious fanatics

1. W. Perkins, <u>Of the Calling of the Ministerie</u> (1605), pp. 6-7.
2. <u>Ibid</u>., p. 48.
3. <u>Ut per</u> Haller, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 20.

who assemblied to proclaim some future woe upon their enemies.[1] The name was derived from the precept of St. Paul: "Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." (I Cor. 14:31). A precedent for this exercise was found in the services which John A'Lasco conducted in his London church during the reign of Edward VI; the purpose of these meetings had been that of resolving doubts and reviewing sermons, at which both ministers and laymen spoke.[2] On June 5, 1571, a similar service was instituted at All Saints' Church in Northampton:

> 'There is on euery other Satterdaye, and nowe euery Satterdaie from ix to xi of the clocke in the mornynge, an exercise of the mynisters bothe of Towne and countrye about the interpretacon of scriptures, the mynisters speaking one after another doth handell some texte, and the same openly amonge the people.'[3]

Every participating minister was to declare his consent to Christ's true religion and was to submit to the discipline and order which had been set up for conducting the exercises. The written word of God was to exceed all other authority--not only that of the pope of Rome, but that "'of the church also, of councils, fathers, or others whosoever, either men or angels.'" Condemning as a tyrannous yoke "'whatsoever men have set up of their own inventions, to make articles of our faith, or to bind men's conscience by their laws and institutes,'" the Northampton ministers signed in their confession of faith that they content themselves with "'the simplicity of this pure word of God,'"

1. Marsden, op. cit., pp. 103-104.
2. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 95. Vide A. H. Drysdale, History of the Presbyterians in England (London: Publication Committee of Presbyterian Church of England, 1889), 40-51.
3. Ut per Geoffrey F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience (Oxford: Blackwell, 1946), 76. Vide Ibid., ch. V for an excellent treatment of this subject.

to which they humbly submitted themselves and all their doings, being "'willing and ready to be judged, reformed, or further instructed thereby, in all points of religion.'"[1] Three ministers were appointed for each exercise and a text assigned to them. The first explained the text fully (for three quarters of an hour), confuting foolish interpretations, making some practical reflection, but not dilating to a common place; the second and third speakers had only one quarter of an hour each in which they could add anything the first speaker had omitted or correct anything spoken contrary to the scripture. After the auditors were dismissed, the moderator or president called the learned brethren together to give their judgment of the performances. If during the service any should break order, the president would command him in the name of the eternal God, to be silent.[2] Judging them "profitable for the advancement of godly knowledge," the Bishop of Norwich granted license for these exercises at Bury St. Edmunds; in October of 1574, the Bishop of Lincoln sent to his clergy rules for the regulation of the prophesyings, in which the speakers were warned against falling into present controversies, prayer was commanded to be made for the queen, and only those who had subscribed and promised not to defame 'the present state of the Church of England' were to be allowed to speak.[3] These meetings became very popular; Barclay says that they "increased the number of able preachers, and fostered in the people a spirit of inquiry and Biblical research; they spread through the

1. Ut per Strype, Annals, vol. II, pp. 139-140.
2. Vide Neal, op. cit., pp. 184-185.
3. Vide Strype, Annals, vol. II, pp. 139-140 & 472-476.

kingdom with great rapidity."[1] In explaining their popularity, Dale reminds us that in those days there were few opportunities for public discussion; and as people had seen men die for articles of faith, they now eagerly sought to understand even the most difficult doctrine; preaching had not become common, and the issues between the Puritans and the Bishops were becoming sharper and more dangerous.

> Sometimes an extreme Puritan who had been silenced for Nonconformity would make his appearance and take part in the meeting. Sometimes a layman seems to have risen in the congregation, and not only ventured to speak, but was respectfully heard.[2]

At first only the ministers spoke, but as prophesying grew in popularity, the laymen began to claim a right to 'exercise their gifts' also, and apparently did take an active part in the discussion, as the bishops' later prohibitions reveal.[3]

Although many of the bishops favored the exercises as means of training preachers, the queen was suspicious of them and commanded the ecclesiastical commission 'to look narrowly into any novelties introduced into the church, and to set an effectual stop thereunto.' Threatened with dangers from without and from within, Elizabeth had no sympathy for the Puritan agitation for further reforms. When Mary, Queen of Scotland sought refuge in England, she became at once the object of Catholic hope and loyalty and was an immediate threat to Elizabeth's throne; troubles arose in the North of England, and in 1569 the Bible and Prayer-Book were torn to pieces in the Durham

1. Robert Barclay, The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876), 24-25.
2. R. W. Dale, History of English Congregationalism (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), 104.
3. Vide Nuttall, op. cit., pp. 76-77, Barclay, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

Cathedral. Elizabeth had to be alert for plots against her, and in 1570 came the delayed papal excommunication. She staved off foreign intervention by feigning interest in a proposed marriage with the brother of the French king; she pacified the Romanists in England at the expense of the Puritans.[1] Although she might have disliked making "'windows into men's hearts and secret thoughts,'"[2] she was determined to uphold her prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs, and thought 'none of her subjects worthy of her protection that favoured innovations, or that directly or indirectly countenanced the alteration of any thing established in the church;' she thought the safety of her government depended upon 'absolute obedience.'[3] Puritanism offered less than absolute obedience, and thereby incurred her opposition. Even those who tried faithfully to serve her did not escape her Tudor wrath; in an account given by Waddington of a Council at 'Somerset Place', the lord treasurer charged the Bishop of Lichfield with making "seventy ministers in one day for money: some tailors, some shoemakers, and other craftsmen." The Bishop of Rochester replied:

> '. . . But, my lord, if you would have none but learned preachers admitted into the ministry you must provide living for them.'
>
> My lord of Canterbury: 'To have learned ministers in every parish is, in my judgment, impossible. Being thirteen thousand parishes in England, I know not how this realm should yield so many learned preachers.'
>
> The Queen: 'Jesus! thirteen thousand is not to be looked for. I think the time has been there hath not been four in a diocese. My meaning is, not you should make choice of learned preachers only, but of honest, sober, and wise men, and such as can read the homilies well unto the people.'[4]

1. Vide Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 353. Also Neal, op. cit., pp. 202-203.
2. Walsingham, ut per Burnet, Reformation, vol. II, p. 653.
3. Ut per Neal, op. cit., p. 204.
4. Ut per John Waddington, Congregational History (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1874), 37-38.

In this same Council the queen reported that she had heard that in one diocese there were six preachers who preached six sundry ways; she declared:

> 'I wish such men to be brought to conformity and unity, that they . . . preach all one truth; and that such as be found not worthy to preach to be compelled to read homilies . . . for there is more learning in one of those than in twenty of some of their sermons. . . .'[1]

She came to regard the exercises as 'seminaries of puritanism'[2] and in 1574 ordered Parker to suppress them. However, only in Norwich were they suppressed at this time; elsewhere they seemed to have continued "'to the comfort of God's church, increase of knowledge in the ministry, without offence.'"[3]

Grindal, who was consecrated archbishop in 1575, favored the exercises and sought to safe-guard them by issuing regulations for them. He limited them to the authorization of the bishops, with the bishops appointing the moderator, choosing the scripture and approving the speakers; 'ante ommia . . . no lay person was to be suffered to speak publicly in those assemblies,' nor was any deprived or silenced minister who had refused to conform; no man was to be allowed 'to make any invections against the laws, rites, policies and discipline of the Church of England established by public authority.'[4] However, the queen was not pleased with the mere reformation and regulation of the exercises; she wanted them suppressed. In a long letter (Dec. 10, 1576), Grindal sought to overcome her prejudices and to win her

1. Waddington, op. cit., pp. 37-38.
2. Vide Neal, op. cit., p. 219.
3. Bishop of Rochester ut per Strype, Annals, vol. II, p. 480. Vide pp. 477-480.
4. Ut per Prothero, op. cit., pp. 204-205.

support for them. Reminding her majesty that it was the bishops' duty to send forth a free, unfettered and able ministry to teach and preach, the archbishop argued that he and his fellow-bishop had found the exercises the means of training such; he proceeded to discuss 'the matter and order' of them, citing the authority they have in the Scriptures, what benefits they bestow upon the church and what handicap would follow their suppression. After referring to the practises in the times of Samuel (I Sam. 10:5-13) and of Elisha (II Kings 2:5-22), Grindal writes of the exercises in the Corinth church (I Cor. 14:1-40):

> 'That exercise in the church in those days St. Paul called _prophetia_, and the speakers _prophetas_,--terms very odious in our days to some, because they are not rightly understood; for, indeed, _prophetia_, in that and like places of the same Paul, doth not (as it doth sometimes) signify prediction of things to come, which things, or which gift, is not now ordinary in the church of God, but signifieth thereby the assent and consent of the Scriptures. And, therefore, doth St. Paul attribute unto these that be called _prophetae_ in that chapter, _doctrinam ad aedificationem, exhortationem, et consolationem_. This gift of expounding and interpreting the Scriptures was, in St. Paul's time, given unto many by a special miracle without study; so was also by miracle the gift to speak strange tongues which they had never learned. But now, miracles ceasing, men must attain to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongues, &c by travail and study: God giveth the increase. So must men also attain by the like means to the gifts of expounding and interpreting the Scriptures; and, amongst other helps, nothing is so necessary as these above-named exercises and conferences amongst the ministers of the church; which in effect are all one with the exercises of students in divinity in the universities, saving that the first is done in a tongue understood, to the more edifying of the learned hearers.'[1]

Among the 'profits and commodities' which had come of the exercises, Grindal mentions that the ministers are withdrawn from idleness, wanderings and gaming and are driven to study, that some suspected in doctrine are brought to the knowledge of the truth, that popery

1. _Ut per_ Fuller, _op. cit._, vol. III, p. 14. _Vide_ pp. 10-16.

is beaten down by an increasing able ministry; whereas formerly there were not three able ministers to preach at Paul's Cross, now there are thirty or forty. Although there might have been some abuse of 'this good and necessary exercise,' he reasons that the malice of a few should not prejudice all. Convinced by reason, Scripture and experience that the exercises were "both profitable to increase knowledge amongst ministers, and tendeth to the edifying of the hearers," Grindal concludes his letter with this brave stand:

> 'I am enforced with all humility and yet plainly to profess, that I cannot with safe conscience, and without the offence of the majesty of God, give mine assent to the suppressing of the said exercises; much less can I send out any injunction for the utter and universal subversion of the same.'[1]

After eight days of an ominous silence, Elizabeth wrote directly to the bishops, charging them with permitting great assemblies of people for disputing and setting forth "'new devised opinions upon matters of divinity,'" whereby "'great numbers of our people . . . are brought to idleness and seduced . . . and encouraged to the violation of our laws.'" She charged them individually to see that "'these dishonours against the honour of God and the quietness of the Church reformed'" cease and that the maintainers of such disorder be committed to prison; she warned:

> 'And in these things we charge you to be so careful and vigilant as by your negligence . . . we be not forced to make some example or reformation of you according to your deserts.'[2]

Grindal himself was stripped of all authority and confined to his own house; the bishops complied with her command, and officially prophesying

1. Ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 15-16.
2. Ut per Prothero, op. cit., pp. 205-206.

ceased; however, as Frere says,

> the question was not really closed. In some dioceses, where the bishops approved, 'exercise' of a very similar character went on. . . . The prophesying went on in subterranean fashion, breaking out at intervals as the puritan claim for liberty of prophesying grew.[1]

The evils which Grindal had foreseen soon manifested themselves: preaching declined, the clergy and laity grew further apart; some of the more advanced Puritans began to despair of reforming the established church and began to turn aside to separate congregations where they could worship in forms which they considered purer and where they could preach the Word more freely.[2]

In July 1566, some of the Puritan ministers had signed an agreement, protesting against the "idolatrous geare" and declaring that

> it was their duty in their present circumstances, to break off from the publick churches, and to assemble, as they had opportunity, in private houses, or elsewhere, to worship God in a manner that might not offend against the light of their consciences.[3]

Although most of these seemed to have "'returned to a better mind,'"[4] there were others who did meet apart from the established church. In John Stowe's Memoranda there is a reference (1567/8) to a group of "'Anabaptysts in London, who cawlyd themselvs Puritans or Unspottyd Lambs of the Lord;'" their "'preachar'" was a man named Brown; they were often apprehended but were "'sone delyvered withoute punishemente.'"[5]

1. Frere, op. cit., p. 194.
2. Vide Marsden, op. cit., pp. 113 & 123-125.
3. Neal op. cit., p. 154.
4. Grindal, ut per Champlin Burrage, The Early English Dissenters In the Light of Recent Research (1550-1641), (2 vols., Cambridge: University Press, 1912), I, 79.
5. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 84-85.

From the Spanish Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs, Burrage quotes this interesting passage, dated February 16, 1568 [7]:

> 'About a week ago they discovered here a newly invented sect, called by those who belong to it "the pure or stainless religion." They met to the number of 150 in a house where their preacher used a half a tub for a pulpit, and was girded with a white cloth. Each one brought with him whatever food he had at home to eat, and the leaders divided money amongst those who were poorer, saying that they imitated the life of the apostles and refused to enter the temples to partake of the Lord's supper as it was a papistical ceremony. This having come to the ears of the city authorities, they, in accord with the Queen's Council, sent 40 halberdiers to arrest the people. They found them meeting in the house and arrested the preacher and five of the principals, leaving the others, and have appointed persons to convert them.'[1]

On June 19, 1567, a group of about a hundred was arrested in Plumbers' Hall for holding a religious service under the pretense of celebrating a wedding. When charged with forsaking their parish churches and setting up unlawful meetings of their own, one of their leaders, Smith, replied that as long as they had the word freely preached they never assembled together in houses, but when all their preachers were silenced

> 'then we bethought us what were best to do; and we remembered that there was a congregation of us in this city in queen Mary's days, and a congregation at Geneva, which used a book and order of preaching . . . most agreeable to the word of God . . . which book and order we now hold. And, if you can reprove this book, or any thing that we hold, by the word of God, we will yield to you . . . ; if not, we will stand to it, by the grace of God.'[2]

In a letter to Henry Bullinger (June 1568) Grindal writes of a sect of about two hundred "'London citizens of the lowest order'" who together with four or five ministers had "'openly separated from us'" and who

1. Ut per Burrage, vol. I, p. 85.
2. Ut per Thomas Price, The History of Protestant Nonconformity in England, from the Reformation under Henry VIII (2 vols. London, 1836), I, 206-207.

"'sometimes in private houses, sometimes in the fields, and occasionally even in ships,'" had held their meetings and administered the sacraments; they had ordained ministers, elders and deacons after their own way and had even excommunicated some who had seceded from their church.[1] Burrage suggests that the 'privye churche' which petitioned the queen sometime around 1571 was formed by these seceders and that they had already been discovered when they signed their appeal; twenty-seven signatures declared that they 'do serve the lord every saboth day in houses, and on the fourth day in the weke we meet or cum together weekely to vse prayer & exercyse disciplyne on them whiche do deserve it.'[2] In his letter to Bullinger (August 8, 1571), Bishop Horn refers to "'some men of inferior rank'" who perceiving that the church would not square with their vanities have shaped out for themselves "'their own barks, call together conventicles, elect their own bishops, . . . and devise their own laws for themselves;'" he declares that they would have all churches destroyed as having been formerly dedicated to popery and that they deride the office of minister as "'not worth a straw.'"[3] Likewise Bishop Cox writes (Feb. 1571/2), that there were some who "'now obstinately refuse to enter our churches, either to baptize their children, or to partake of the Lord's supper, or to hear sermons:'"

> 'They are entirely separated both from us and from those good brethren of ours; . . . they establish a private religion, and assemble in private houses, and there perform their sacred rites, as the Donatists of old, and the Anabaptists now.'[4]

1. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 80-81. Cf. Clark, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 175-177.
2. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 92. Vide Dale, op. cit., p. 95 for the claim that this 'privye churche' was "the first regularly constituted English Congregational Church of which any records remain." Cf. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 90-93.
3. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 89.
4. Ibid., pp. 89-90.

With their failure to get any relief from the Parliament of 1571, the more moderate Puritans began to consider other services. On November 20, 1572 at Wandsworth in Surrey "a Presbytery" was erected, with a body of Elders chosen from the congregation "to co-operate with John Field, the Lecturer of Wandsworth, in matters of Church rule and discipline among the Puritan portions of the parishioners;" Drysdale describes it as

> a Church within a Church, consisting of those who desired a purer Communion, and who combined together for higher fellowship and discipline than what the ordinary Church regulations required.[1]

With the victory of the Presbyterian system in Scotland and the continued persecutions of the Puritans in England, the Presbyterian form of church government grew in popularity among those who desired further reforms, and other groups were secretly organized in accord with the Presbyterian ideal.[2] In his reply to Whitgift in 1573, Cartwright argued for a church reformation according to the Apostolic model, which was to his mind "undoubtedly Presbyterian;" he, too, desired uniformity, but as Pearson says, it was "a Presbyterian uniformity" for which he pleaded. Reasoning that all Scripture was equally binding, Cartwright held that the death penalty set forth in the Old Testament for heresy was still valid; no toleration was offered to those "sectarian" teachers who varied from the Truth.[3]

One of the "sects" which both Anglicans and Puritans detested was the Family of Love, whose founder, Henry Nicholas, had come from

1. Drysdale, op. cit., pp. 143-144. Cf. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 74-81, Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, p. 505.
2. Vide Marsden, op. cit., p. 62.
3. Vide Pearson, op. cit., pp. 90-101.

Holland during the latter part of the reign of Edward VI.[1] In 1575, Nicholas' followers published An Apology, in which they denied the false reports of their faith and practice and confessed their acceptance of the Apostles Creed, the Holy Scriptures and the statutes of the Church of England. One of their principles was the allegorizing or spiritualizing of the prescribed services so that they could conform to the religious practices of any land; they were told to go to the prescribed church and 'to mark only upon the signification' of sacraments, ceremonies, images, etc. which were but 'shadows of good and holy things' and to think 'what a Christian life and obedience to God and governors . . . do ask and require of them.'[2] The authorities were searching for the Familists as early as 1574 when they discovered, in the parish of Balsham in Cambridgeshire, another group which

> used to meet together on certain holydays after supper. And there they read the scriptures, and sung psalms, and conferred together upon matters of religion, and propounded questions, for the edifying themselves in godliness. And this these well-disposed persons did, instead of the common custom on holydays of carding and dicing, and spending the time at alehouses. And accordingly, they made a declaration and confession of this, and of their sober opinions and doctrines; and submitted to authority.[3]

However some of the Familists were discovered and at least five of them had to recant at St. Paul's Cross in June of 1575. From the writings and teachings of Nicholas, there came a variety of opinions and practices; some of these subdivisions were headed by ministers, such as John Etchard and John Eaton who taught that "'God cannot see

1. Vide Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 519-520.
2. Ut per Strype, Annals, vol. II, pp. 557-561, passim.
3. Strype, Annals, vol. II, pp. 556 & 562. Vide Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 520-521.

sin in the justified.'"[1] The Family of Essentialists was headed by a Mrs. Dunbar, a "Scotch woman," who held that there was no sin at all, as God does all that is done; a tailor by the name of Lockley, who referred to the altar as 'a cook's dresser-board' and who said that 'no man sinneth at all,' conducted "many meetings up and down, and would spend 20 l. or 30 l. at a sitting."[2] A former member of the Family of the Mount acknowledged to Strype that their members believed that "all things came by nature" and that they "held all things common, and lived in contemplation altogether; denying all prayer, and resurrection of the body."[3] The Anabaptist was still the chief of the "sects," and in April of 1575 "a Congregation of Dutch Anabaptists" was discovered "without Aldgate," twenty-seven of whom were imprisoned; later four bore faggots at Paul's Cross, eight others were banished, and two, John Wielmacker and Hendrick Ter Woort, were burned at Smithfield.[4] Only Foxe protested against this "indelible blot on the English reformation;"[5] others wrote books to confute their "heresies" and to make their very name a shibboleth which was used to condemn every form of religious expression which varied from the established order. To the English, the Anabaptists were foreign, and the stories told about them created such a prejudice toward them that they left little influence on the religious life of England. The main story of English Separatism, however, does not come of any of these foreign

1. Ut per Strype, Annals, vol. II, pp. 562-563.
2. Ibid., vide Marsden, op. cit., pp. 140-141.
3. Strype, Annals, vol. II, p. 563.
4. Vide Fuller, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 506-509.
5. Vide Price, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 294-296. The cordial welcome extended to the Huguenots is somewhat marred by the cruelty done to these who also had sought refuge from religious persecution.

groups or influence; it flows out of the very heart of English Puritanism.

As a pupil of Cartwright and Greenham, Robert Browne was a child of prophetic Puritanism;[1] his preaching at Cambridge in 1579 indicated he had "advanced" even beyond his teachers. He refused to pay for the preaching license which his brother had secured for him and "subsequently destroyed it;"[2] he declined the offer of a parish church because he did not want to be ordained by a bishop, and instead went to Norwich where early in 1581 he began to gather his 'companie'.[3] In the covenant which his followers took 'to hould to gether,' they pledged themselves to flee from all wickedness and to join themselves to the Lord in fellowship one with another; they agreed on those who should teach and watch over them and upon the order for their meetings and exercises. The exhorting and edifying were not limited to those who had a special charge above others, but 'all men which had the guift' were permitted to speak; they agreed upon

> 'the lavvefulness off putting forth questions, to learne the trueth, as iff anie thing seemed doubtful & hard, to require some to shevve it more plainly, or for anie to shevve it him selfe & to cause the rest to vnderstand it. . . . Again it vvas agreed that anie might protest, appeale, complaine, exhort, dispute, reproue &c. as he had occasion, but yet in due order, vvhich vvas then also declared. Also that all should further the kingdom off God in them selves, & especiallie in their charge & household, iff thei had anie, or in their freindes & companions & vvhosoever vvas vvorthie.'[4]

1. Vide Haller, op. cit., pp. 28-29.
2. C. Slivester Horne, A Popular History of the Free Churches (3rd ed., London: James Clarke & Co., 1903), 11.
3. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 96.
4. Robert Browne, "A Trve and Short Declaration" (pp. 19-20), ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 98-99.

The Bishop of Norwich soon heard of "'one Robert Browne, a minister,'" who had been seducing "'the vulgar sort of the people'" with "'corrupt and contentious doctrine'" and who had been assembling great crowds in private "'houses and conventicles.'"[1] On April 19, 1581 Browne was arrested, and Burleigh began his long and patient intercession on behalf of his kinsman whose error he judged to be more of "zeal rather than malice." At Middelburg, Zealand, Browne wrote his famous work, A Book which Sheweth The life and manners of all trve Christians, the first section of which, "A Treatise of Reformation without tarying for Anie," ridiculed the waiting upon magistrates to reform the Church.

> 'They saye the time has not yet come to build the Lorde's house: they must tarie for the magistrates and for Parliament to do it.' 'Can the Lorde's spiritual government be in no way executed but by the civil sworde?' 'The dispensation [to preach] is committed unto me, and this dispensation did not the Magistrate give me, but God, by consent and ratifying of the church; and therefore, as the Magistrate gave it not, so can he not take it away.'[2]

Burrage says that in this work Browne sets forth separation as "a means towards the ideal end of producing a true Church of England, which should be unfettered by Prince, . . . Parliament, or magistrate;" he separated from the State Church, because he believed that evil men should not be accepted in the church.[3] In his second treatise, Browne advises his followers to avoid "'the Popishe disorders, and ungodly communion of all false Christians, and especially of wicked Preachers and hirelings;'" he condemns some of his contemporary preachers for

1. Ut per Strype, Annals, vol. III, p. 22. Fuller says that Browne began with the "Dutch strangers" at Norwich and "soon proceeded to infect his own countrymen." Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, p. 62.
2. Ut per Dale, op. cit., p. 129.
3. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 101-102.

their Latin, Greek and Hebrew quotations, their technical terms of rhetoric, their vain logic and their curious methods and divisions.[1] His third treatise presents a church polity which Burrage says might be called "the outline of a spiritual and ecclesiastical Utopia," in which everything, including the magistrate, is to be regulated by the people for the benefit of the people.[2] However, Dale says that Browne did not hold that the powers of pastors, teachers and elders were derived from the people, but that the church has the right to judge what ministers God had chosen for them; Browne describes the pastor as

> 'a person having office and message of God, for exhorting and moving especially, and guiding accordingly: for the which he is tried to be meet, and thereto is duly chosen by the church which calleth him or received by obedience where he planteth the church.'[3]

Returning to England through Scotland where he was imprisoned "'more wrongfully then anie Bishop would have done,'"[4] Browne defended Separation against his old teacher, Cartwright; but at last in 1585, after ten years of suffering in and out of thirty-two prisons, he "broke" and consented to some kind of subscription, which made him more ridiculous to his enemies and a traitor in the eyes of his followers. Broken and exhausted by the persecutions and labors, Browne dropped aside,[5] while the movement which he had initiated swept on beyond him, bearing his name with the odium of his last years attached to it.

The Brownists were not alone in despairing of the magistrate's reformation; petition after petition for further reform had met with no

1. Dale, op. cit., pp. 130-131.
2. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 103.
3. Ut per Dale, op. cit., pp. 127-128.
4. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 111.
5. Vide Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, p. 65.

success, until at length the House of Commons was informed that the queen was 'already settled in her religion' and that any question about the established church was prejudicial to her crown and to the peace of her government. Neal says:

> The puritans being wearied out with repeated applications to their superiors for relief, began to despair, and in one of their assemblies came to this conclusion; that since the magistrate could not be induced to reform the discipline of the church, by so many petitions and supplications . . . that therefore after so many years waiting, it was lawful to act without him, and introduce a reformation in the best manner they could.[1]

The Puritan reformers had not exactly been waiting on the magistrate, for upon the suppression of the exercises in 1577 they began secret conferences which became "embryonic assemblies of a Presbyterian Church of England;" they conferred on the problems of subscribing, adopted a Book of Discipline (1586) and directed the agitation for further reformation.[2] Among the five hundred ministers who attended these various conferences or classes were such prominent leaders as Cartwright, Greenham, Johnson, Chadderton, Perkins, Bradshaw, Hildersham, Dod, Rogers, Udall, Paget and Field. Men like John Field, whom Albert Peel describes as "a propagandist par excellence,"[3] favored an aggressive program, especially after John Whitgift was made archbishop in 1583. Writing to Dr. Chapman, Nov. 19, 1583, Field says that the new archbishop had shown himself an enemy to the gospel and urges his friend to use whatever means he could. "'It wilbe to late to deale after-

1. Neal, op. cit., p. 323.
2. Vide Pearson, op. cit., pp. 236-238.
3. The Seconde Parte of a Register, ed. Albert Peel, (2 vols., Cambridge: University Press, 1915), I, "Introduction," 14.

warde,'" he writes;

> 'The peace of the Church is at an End, if he be not curbed. You are wise to consider by advise and joigning together now to strengthen your handes in this worke. The Lord direct both you and us that we may fighte a good fighte and fynish with joy.'[1]

Cartwright and others withheld their approval of drastic means; they bitterly denounced the Brownists and such who would not "tarry," and continued their efforts to accomplish further reformation by presenting petitions to Commons.[2] These conservative Puritans endeavored to wipe off "the calumny of schism" by continuing to communicate with the parish church and promised not to take upon themselves "a vague or wandering ministry."[3]

Many of the deprived Puritan preachers served as chaplains to the families of Puritan noblemen and gentlemen, as did John Greenwood until the Bishop of London charged his patron with permitting a 'conventicle' in his house. Later in 1886/7, Greenwood was arrested in the house of one Henry Martin, for reading the Scriptures to a small group; a few days later Henry Barrowe, whom Soames describes as Greenwood's "lay associate"[4] came to visit Greenwood and was seized. When Burleigh asked him why he did not come to 'our churches,' Barrowe replied:

> 'My lord, the causes are great and many; as 1. Because all the wicked in the land are received into the Communion; 2. You have a false and Antichristian ministry set over your church; 3. You do not worship God aright, but in an idolatrous and a superstitious manner; and 4. Your church is not governed by the Testament of Christ, but by the Romish Courts and Canons.'

1. Ut per Peel, Seconde Parte, vol. I, "Intro.," p. 14.
2. Vide Drysdale, op. cit., pp. 196-197.
3. Vide Neal, op. cit., pp. 328-329.
4. Henry Soames, Elizabethan Religious History (London: John W. Parker, 1838), 416.

Burghley: 'Here is matter enough, indeed. I perceive thou takest delight to be an author of this new religion.'
Chancellor: 'I never heard such stuff in all my life. Do you hold tithes to be unlawful?'
Barrow: 'My lord, such laws are abrogated and unlawful.'[1]

From their prison Barrowe and Greenwood managed to slip out bits of writings which were pieced together and printed in Holland. In his principal work, "A Brief Discoverie of the False Church" (1590), Barrowe denounces the English Church as the daughter of the Roman apostasy, infected with the vices, corruption and superstitions of her origin; he states that the 'holy oracles' had been committed to the whole church by Christ and that it was the duty of every particular member to maintain their purity. As the members of the church have various gifts, he reasons that they are all to serve according to the grace given to every one; if any have the gift of prophesy, then they were to exercise it according to the proportion of faith, always keeping to the Word of God. The gift of prophesy "'belongeth to the whole church,'" and none of those who possess it ought to be shut out. Denouncing the universities as a complete failure in their mission of training Christian ministers and as "'the very hives and nurseries of these armed locusts,'" Barrowe wants the whole church to be trained, saying that "'the Protestant nobility, as well as the common people, were prophets.'"[2] By these writings Barrowe became the leader of the Separatist movement; he detested the name of Brownist, and traced his principles to Cartwright who, however, disowned him for his radical position.

1. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 31.
2. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., pp. 48-49. Dale, op. cit., pp. 148-149.

After the defeat of the Spanish Armada, the conservative Puritans thought that surely some moderation of the laws of uniformity would be made and further reformation might be possible; they had strong support in the House of Commons (1588/9), but the queen listened to the bishops' cry "to protect the church" and the House was again reprimanded for meddling in religious affairs.[1] Barred from the pulpits, denied the open press, frustrated in Parliament, disappointed in the petitions, some of the aggressive Puritans began to write and secretly print satirical pamphlets against the bishops. Under the name of Martin Marprelate, a group of them[2] set the nation laughing and the bishops fuming. Playing "the dunce," Martin declared war upon the bishops and promised to publish to the nation whatever they did amiss. Some of the Puritan preachers were offended by this method; Martin replied to them:

> 'I did think that Martin should not have been blamed of the Puritans for telling the truth openly. For, may I not say that John of Canterbury is a petty pope, seeing he is so? You must then bear with my ingramness ignorance . I am plain; I must needs call a spade a spade; a pope a pope. I speak not against him, as he is a Councillor; but as he is an Archbishop, and so Pope of Lambeth. What! will the Puritans seek to keep out the Pope of Rome, and maintain the Pope at Lambeth? Because you will do this, I will tell the Bishops how they shall deal with you. Let them say that the hottest of you hath made Martin, and that the rest of you are consenting thereunto . . .'[3]

Cooper, Bishop of Winchester, tried to answer Martin:

> 'It is the duty of all to conceal the faults of their superiors rather than to expose them, and not to envy their

1. Vide Waddington, op. cit., pp. 35-38.
2. Matthew Sntcliffe said in 1595 that 'John Penry, John Udall, John Field; all Johns; and Job Throkmorton, all concurred in making Martin.' Vide Peel, Seconde Parte, vol. I, pp. 16-17. Also The Marprelate Tracts, ed William Pierce (London: James Clarke, 1911), 289.
3. Pierce, Marprelate Tracts, "The Epitome," pp. 118-119.

> greatness or their wealth. If the Archbishop for recreation plays at bowls on Sunday, he does not leave the service for this pastime, and he attends prayers twice every day in the week.'[1]

The "discomfited and unhappy prelates" appealed to the queen for help, and a proclamation was issued (Feb. 13, 1588/9) 'to have such enormous malefactors discovered, and condignly punished.'[2] Cartwright was summoned and closely examined; the secret press was discovered, and the houses of some of the leading Puritans were ransacked for private papers; John Udall was arrested and condemned to death on a charge of libelling the bishops, although it was never proven what his relation to Martin had been.[3]

A warrant was issued for John Penry, whose radical views Whitgift remembered; in 1587/8 Penry, an advanced Puritan who had refused the 'Popish orders' at Cambridge and Oxford and who had gone to Wales to preach the Gospel, set forth an audacious scheme whereby his backward country could be supplied with preachers. In his "Treatise Containing the AEquity of an Humble Supplication," Penry proposed that three hundred preachers be sent from the universities to the border-towns, that all clergymen who had been born in Wales and who could speak Welsh be required to return to their country and that Welsh laymen who had 'well profited in divinity' be sent to preach without receiving ordination. For a time the Apostle of Wales escaped by fleeing to Scotland, but in the spring of 1592/3 he was arrested with fifty-six Separatists at a meeting in Islington.[4] Waddington quotes

1. Admonition to the People of England, ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 40.
2. Waddington, op. cit., p. 41.
3. Vide Drysdale, op. cit., pp. 207-216.
4. Vide Dale, op. cit., p. 153.

the following passage from the Harleian manuscripts:

'They acknowledged that they had met in the fields in the summer season, by five o'clock on a Lord's day morning, and in winter in private houses; that they continued all the day in prayer and expounding the Scriptures; dined together, and afterwards made collection for their food; and sent the remainder of the money to their brethren in prison.

'What office had you in your church which meets in woods and I know not where?

John Penry: 'I have no office in that poor congregation; and as to our meeting in woods or elsewhere, we have the example of Jesus Christ, and his Church and servants in all ages, for our warrant. It is against our wills that we go into woods and secret places; as we are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, so our desire is to profess it openly. We are ready before men and angels to show and justify our meetings, and our behaviour in them, earnestly desiring that we may serve our God with peace and quietness; and that all men may witness our upright walking towards our God and all the world, especially towards our prince and government. We know the meeting in woods, in caves, and in mountains, is a part of the cross of the gospel at which the natural man will easily stumble; but we rejoice to be in this mean estate for the Lord's sacred truth. The question should not so much be where we meet, as what we do at our meetings; whether our meetings and doings be warranted by the Word of God, and what constraineth us to meet in those places.

'Francis Johnson, 31 years of age, of uncertain abode. Refuses to be sworn, but saith he hath been twice examined before the Lord Chief Justice of England and the Lord Anderson: once before the Chief Justice and once before them both. He is not aware that he is indicted for any offence.

'How long have you held these opinions?

'I cannot definitely answer; but I was committed to prison four years ago upon reading a sermon in St. Mary's Church, Cambridge.

'Have you, or have you had any of Barrowe, Greenwood, or Penry's books?

'Let me be accused.

'Have you not laboured and persuaded others to the assemblies and congregation of which you are pastor. If so, how many have you so drawn?

'I have done and must do all that God layeth upon me, in duty according to his word. Beyond this I have no answer.'[1]

One man, "Iohn dove", confessed that they taught that

'A pryvatt man being A Brother may preach to begett faieth and noew that thoffice of thappostles is ceaseth there nedeth not, publique mynistres but euery man in his owne calling was to preache.'[2]

1. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., pp. 81-82.
2. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 28-29.

From their confessions and the records of their imprisonment[1] we judge these Separatists to be of many various callings and trades—glovers, tailors, shoemakers, fishmongers, husbandmen, weavers, soldiers, etc.—all of whom, we may conclude from Iohn dove's confession, had been free to preach in their meetings; their services must have resembled something of a free and open prophesying exercise. Daniel Bucke described George Johnson as their "Reader", and others spoke of him as their "Pastor" with Greenwood mentioned as their teacher or doctor;[2] Robert Aburne confessed that "'their Doctor and Pastor weare mayntained by Contribucion from amongest them every one as his abilitie was by Weekelie collection.'"[3] As for the church ordinances, Burrage judges that among them baptism was delayed until it could be secured by one whom they accepted as a true minister and that the celebration of the communion commenced only after the arrival of Francis Johnson.[4] Christofer Bowman, a goldsmith of Smithfield, confessed that he was married to his last wife "'in Penries howse, wher m^r^ Settle vsed praier, and that his opinion is that mariage in a howse without a mynister by Consent of the parties and frends is sufficient;'" Francis Johnson said that he did not account marriage "'an ecclesiasticall matter, nor laid vppon the minister of god as a dewetie of his ministerie.'"[5] Shakespeare knew of these opinions, for in his play As You Like It (1598-1600), he has Touchstone engaging a Sir Oliver Martext to come to the forest to "couple" him and Audrey. Jaques,

1. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 37-61.
2. Ibid., pp. 35, 48; Dale, op. cit., p. 150.
3. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, p. 50.
4. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 127.
5. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 54, 56.

however, is not satisfied with this kind of service and asks Touchstone:

> 'Will you, being a man of your breeding, be married under a bush like a beggar? Get you to church, and have a good priest that can tell you what marriage is: this fellow will but join you together as they join wainscot; then one of you will prove a shrunk panel and, like green timber, warp, warp.'

When Touchstone dismisses "the vicar" and his company departs, Sir Oliver says: ''Tis no matter: ne'er a fantastical knave of them all shall flout me out of my calling.'[1] It seems to have been customary for new members to take a covenant or make some kind of promise upon entering the fellowship; thus William Clerke promised "to stand with the said Congregacion soe longe as they did stand for the truthe and glory of god," and Quintine Smith made "a Covenaunte with the Assembly that as longe as they did walke in the lawes of god hee would forsake all other assemblies and onely folowe them."[2]

At their trial Barrowe and Greenwood tried to distinguish between the Crown and the Church, but the court would not accept such a distinction and condemned them for having written against the liturgy which was held tantamount to libelling the queen, as the liturgy was upheld by her ecclesiastical supremacy. Among the offences for which they were judged guilty were that "'they invite men to take the calling of the ministry upon them, not expecting the bishops ordaining them'" and that "'they blame her Majesty's subjects for that they are no more forward to work the reformation (as they term it of themselves).'"[3] Refusing the persuasions of learned ministers (including even Cartwright),

1. William Shakespear, "As You Like It," Act III, Scene III, lines 84-111., ed. Hardin Craig (New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1931), 423-424.
2. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 33, 45.
3. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 76.

Barrowe and Greenwood were secretly put to death April 6, 1593; Penry followed them on May 29th. Venerating Wycliffe as his master and the martyred Lollards as his models, the Apostle of Wales pleaded for the evangelization of his country unto the end, but in his valedictory letter he warned his brethren to prepare for banishment and urged them to go together so that they might rebuild the church whithersoever they went.[1] The "Nether House" had already passed a bill,

> 'that whosoever shall be an obstinant recusant, refusing to come to any Church, and do deny the Queen to have any power or authority in ecclesiastical causes; and do, by writing or otherwise, publish the same, and be a keeper of conventicles, also being converted; he shall abjure the realm within three months, and lose all his goods and lands; if he return without leave, it shall be felony.'[2]

The Separatists, as they got out of prison or escaped Whitgift's watchmen, began leaving the country for Holland, carrying with them the radical doctrine that laymen also might share in the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

The more moderate Puritans conformed within the limits of the law but continued to voice their discontent in Commons. In 1594 Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity presented the thesis that the church is not restricted to the Scriptures but may appoint ceremonies and establish orders which the people, born within the confines of her jurisdiction and baptized into the church, must accept.[3] In the following year, Nicholas Bound published his treatise on The Sabboth wherein he contended

1. Vide Waddington, op. cit., pp. 88-90.
2. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., pp. 80-81. Vide W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration In England From the beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1932), 213-215 for Sir Walter Raleigh's modifying influence in regard to this bill. His estimate of there being twenty thousand Brownists in England at this time is likely exaggerated.
3. Vide Neal, op. cit., pp. 382-383.

that as the Lord's day is the Christian Sabboth it should be observed as a day of rest and devotion and not given to any worldly business or pleasure. Neal says that "all the puritans fell in with this doctrine," while the governing clergy exclaimed against it as "a restraint of christian liberty" and as putting such a luster on Sunday that it tended "to eclipse the authority of the church in appointing other festivals."[1] Despite Archbishop Whitgift's denunciation of the sabboth doctrine as a disturber of peace and a creator of schism in the church and sedition in the Commonwealth, the book was widely read, and the Sabboth began to be reformed. About this same time the controversy between the Puritans and the conforming clergy began to include a difference in doctrine; while most of the Puritans were Calvinistic, some of the Churchmen began to adopt a latitude for either Calvinism or Arminianism. The Parliament of 1597/8 again voiced the discontent with church matters and sought to regulate the abuses in the spiritual courts, but the queen again intervened. After this there came "a kind of cessation of arms between the church and the puritans," for both parties realized that the queen was "advanced in years" and so began to look to the next heir, whose Presbyterianism caused the bishops to fear and the Puritans to hope.[2] At the age of sixty-nine Elizabeth's health began to fail; by the first of 1602 she began to lose interest in government and delighted only to hear old Canterbury Tales; on March 23rd her councillors gathered around her bed; after they had retired, she bade Whitgift to begin his prayers, and the great queen dropped into unconsciousness.[3]

1. Neal, op. cit., p. 386.
2. Ibid., p. 395.
3. Vide Pollard, History, p. 480.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SEPARATIST LAY-PREACHER (1602-1625)

I. THE PURITAN DISAPPOINTMENT
   A. James I's hostility to the Puritans
   B. Failure in Parliament

II. DEVELOPMENT AMONG THE SEPARATISTS
   A. Increased numbers
   B. Gainsborough and Scroobie
   C. Differences at Amsterdam
   D. Rise of English Baptists

III. ROBINSON'S DEFENSE OF LAY-PROPHESYING
   A. "Justification of Separation"
   B. His defense against Mr. Yates
   C. His defense against Mr. Bernard
   D. Dispersion from Leyden

IV. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
   A. Bible-reading and preaching
   B. Ben Johnson's satire on Puritans and Separatists
   C. Baptist development and practice
   D. Jacob's Independent Church

V. THE POLITICO-ECCLESIASTICAL SITUATION
   A. The decline of the king's popularity
   B. The moral and spiritual conditions
   C. The "religious cheats"

In addressing the general assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1590, James VI had commended the Scottish Church for its purity and had spoken of the English service as "an evil said mass in English;"[1] however, in 1603 when the dean of Canterbury came to recommend the Church of England to his favor and protection, he gave such a gracious answer that the fear of the 'Scotch mist' was somewhat dispelled in the minds of the bishops.[2] Although the Puritans expected a "Presbyterian" king to favor them, they lost no opportunity of informing him of their loyalty and opinions; on his way to London, they presented the millenary petition, which, although it fell short of the thousand signatures, well expressed their desire for further reformation. They asked that the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage, the bowing at the name of Jesus, the cap and surplice be no longer required; that the ministry be limited to able preachers and that means be found to maintain them; that subscription be limited to the king's supremacy and to the articles of religion; that pluralities and non-residences be condemned and that the impropriations made to bishoprics and colleges be given for the maintenance of preaching ministers. Alarmed by this threat to their endowments, the universities published a petition, beseeching his majesty not to heed those who complain against such a well-settled and just government; the bishops, likewise, sought to undo the Puritan petitions and to maintain their ecclesiastical order.[3] As an outcome of these petitions and counter-petitions, the king called

1. Price, op. cit., vol. I, p. 450.
2. Strype, The Life and Acts of John Whitgift (4 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822), II, 469.
3. Vide Strype, Whitgift, vol. II, pp. 481-485.

a conference to assemble at Hampton Court; in his proclamation, he said that while there might be need of correcting some minor abuses, he had reason to think the state of the church to be agreeable to the word of God and wondered if the heat stirred up by some men's spirits did not tend "rather to combustion than reformation."[1] This should have warned the Puritans that the king was not impartial, but they seemed to have been totally unprepared for what happened. As against nineteen representatives of the Anglican position, only four Puritans were invited, and these four were excluded from the first meeting, January 14, 1604. The king opened the conference by assuring the Churchmen that he sought no innovation in the ecclesiastical establishment which had been blessed with "'a happy and glorious peace;'" he thanked God for bringing him into

> 'the promised land, where religion is purely professed, where I sit amongst grave, learned, and reverend men, not as before, elsewhere, a king without state, without honour, without order, where beardless boys would brave us to the face.'[2]

On the second day, the Puritans were called upon to present their case, which Dr. Reynolds condensed to four proposals:

> 1. That the doctrine of the church might be preserved in purity, according to God's word.
> 2. That good pastors might be planted in all churches to preach the same.
> 3. That the church-government might be sincerely ministered according to God's word.
> 4. That the Book of Common-Prayer might be fitted to more increase of piety.[3]

Although the king allowed no question of the bishops' authority, he overruled their objection to Dr. Reynold's request for a new translation

1. Vide, Strype, Whitgift, vol. II, p. 487.
2. Ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, p. 173.
3. Ibid., p. 177.

of the Bible:

> 'I wish some special pains were taken for an uniform translation, which should be done by the best-learned in both universities, then reviewed by the bishops, presented to the Privy Council, lastly, ratified by royal authority, to be read in the whole church, and no other.'[1]

When Dr. Reynolds spoke of planting a learned ministry in every parish, the king replied that it could not presently be performed as the universities could not afford them and the realm could not maintain them; yet the young ignorant ministers should be removed and the old ones would soon die. The Bishop of London, kneeling before the king, petitioned for a praying ministry; "'it being now come to pass, that men think it is the only duty of ministers to spend their time in the pulpit.'"[2] The king approved, saying that he disliked the hypocrisy of the time which placed all religion in the ear and which accounted prayer the least part of religion. The bishop then suggested that "'until learned men may be planted in every congregation, godly Homilies may be read therein,'" which motion was also approved by the king, who added, "'Also, where there be mulitudes of sermons, there I would have Homilies read divers times.'"[3] When Mr. Knewstubs spoke of the cross in baptism, "'whereat the weak brethren were offended,'" the king replied:

> 'How long will such brethren be weak? Are not forty-five years sufficient for them to grow strong in? Besides, who pretends this weakness? We require not subscriptions of laics and idiots, but of preachers and ministers, who are not still (I trow) to be fed with milk, being enabled to feed others. Some of them are strong enough, if not head-strong; conceiving themselves able enough to teach him who last spake for them, and all the bishops in the land.'[4]

1. Ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, p. 182.
2. Ibid., p. 184.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 186.

When Dr. Reynolds asked that the clergy be permitted to "have prophesyings, as archbishop Grindal and other bishops desired of her late majesty," the "Presbyterian" king replied:

> 'If you aim at a Scottish presbytery, it agreeth as well with monarchy, as God and the devil. Then Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick shall meet and censure me and my Council. Therefore I reiterate my former speech, Le roy s'avisera. . . . I shall speak of one matter more, somewhat out of order, but it skilleth not. Dr. Reynolds, you have often spoken for my supremacy, and it is well. But know you any here or elsewhere, who like of the present government ecclesiastical, and dislike my supremacy?'
>
> Dr. Reynolds. 'I know none.'
>
> His Majesty. 'Why, then, I will tell you a tale: After that the religion restored by king Edward VI. was soon overthrown by queen Mary here in England, we in Scotland felt the effect of it. For, thereupon, Mr. Knox writes to the queen regent, a virtuous and moderate lady; telling her, that she was the supreme head of the church, and charged her, as she would answer it to God's tribunal, to take care of Christ's Evangel, in suppressing the popish prelates, who withstood the same. But how long, trow you, did this continue? Even till, by her authority, the popish bishops were repressed, and Knox, with his adherents, being brought in, made strong enough. Then began they to make small account of her supremacy, when, according to that more light wherewith they were illuminated, they made a farther reformation of themselves. How they used the poor lady my mother, is not unknown, and how they dealt with me in my minority. I thus apply it: my lords the bishops, [this he said, putting his hand to his hat,] I may thank you that these men plead thus for my supremacy. They think they cannot make their party good against you, but by appealing unto it. But if once you were out and they in, I know what would become of my supremacy; for, "No bishop, no king!" I have learned of what cut they have been, who, preaching before me since my coming into England, passed over, with silence, my being supreme governor in causes ecclesiastical. Well, doctor, have you any thing else to say?'
>
> Dr. Reynolds. 'No more, if it please your majesty.'
>
> His Majesty. 'If this be all your party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse.'[1]

The third and last day, January 19th, began with a discussion of the High Commission Court whose authority the king upheld; the Bishop of London was so overcome that he fell to his knees: "'I protest, my heart

1. Ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 188-189.

melteth with joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, hath given us such a king, as, since Christ's time, the like hath not been.'"[1] Addressing Dr. Reynolds, the king said he expected obedience and humility from him and his associates and that they would persuade others by their example. Dr. Reynolds replied:"'We here do promise to perform all duties to bishops, as reverend fathers, and to join with them against the common adversary for the quiet of the church.'"[2] As we can imagine, this famous conference produced many varied reactions and has received different evaluations, none of which are perhaps as interesting as what the king himself wrote of it. Addressing some unknown person in Scotland, whom he calls 'my honest Blake,' King James wrote:

> 'We have kept such a revell with the Puritans here this two days, as was never heard the like: quhaire I have peppered thaime as soundlie as yee have done the Papists thaire. It were no reason, that those that will refuse the airy sign of the cross after baptism should have their purses stuffed with any more solid and substantial crosses. They fled me so from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly, ut est eorum moris, as I was forced at last to say unto thaime; that if any of thaime had been in a college disputing with thair scholars, if any of thair disciples had answered them in that sort, they would have fetched him up in a place of a reply; and so should the rod have plyed upon the poor boyes buttocks. I have such a book of thaires as may well convert infidels, but it shall never convert me, except by turning me more earnestly against thayme.'[3]

Disappointed and perhaps embittered, the Puritans turned to Parliament, whose meeting Whitgift so greatly dreaded that he wished he might not live to see it.[4] His death (February 29th) with that of Cartwright's a few months earlier marked the end of the second phase of the Puritan struggle. Whereas death had reconciled Hooper and

1. Ut per Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, p. 190.
2. Ibid., p. 191.
3. Ut per Strype, Whitgift, vol. III, p. 408.
4. Frere, op. cit., p. 309. Vide Strype, Whitgift, vol. II, pp. 505-507.

Ridley, when it came to the second contenders, the Church party had so allied itself with the Crown and the Reform party had so identified itself with Commons that the third phase of the struggle opened with an ominous note which the dying archbishop might well have feared. In his opening speech to his first Parliament, March 21, 1604, the king spoke of "'the quarrelsomeness of the Puritans and Novelists'" and indicated some "benevolent intentions" towards those "'falsely called Catholics.'"[1] The country was not long in expressing its alarm; the House of Commons voiced the Puritan protest and supported the Millenary Petition. Trevelyan says that the king failed to realize that "the flustered divines who had picked up their Turkey gowns and scurried from his presence amid the laughter of Bishops, represented the religion of the gentry and the towns of England."[2] However, the Commons made no impression on the Convocation, and when they addressed a noble apology to the king for the amelioration of the ministry, they were "dismissed with a scolding."[3] On July 16, 1604, it was proclaimed that all the clergy which refused to subscribe to the new canons passed by the Convocation were to be deprived. Despite the bitter and threatening petitions which poured in from all parts of the country,[4] Archbishop Bancroft issued (Dec. 22, 1604) the directive for deprivation; and something like three hundred Puritan preachers were silenced.[5] Carleton wrote (Feb. 20, 1605): "'The poor puritan ministers have been ferreted

1. Frere, op. cit., p. 310.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 65.
3. Frere, op. cit., p. 313.
4. Vide Price, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 485-486, Dale op. cit., p. 187.
5. Cf. Dale, op. cit., p. 187; Frere, op. cit., p. 321; Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 66; Haller, op. cit., pp. 381-382.

out in all corners;'" Chamberlaine said (Feb. 26, 1605): "'Our puritans go down on all sides.'"[1] So great a number seems to have surprised and alarmed the bishops; Chamberlaine said,

> '. . . the bishops themselves are loath to proceed too rigorously in casting out and depriving so many well-reputed of for life and learning; only the king is constant to have all come to conformity.'[2]

Whereas heretofore, the Separatists had commanded little respect among the conservative Puritans, this ejection increased their number and prestige. There was no mass conversion to the principles of separation, as most of the 'silenced brethren' still held to the concept of one uniform faith and order; however, many doubtless reconsidered the disadvantages of waiting on the magistrate. Already in Holland there was a church of English exiles who had not tarried for any; others now looked in that direction.

In their Confession of 1596, the Separatists had declared that a church, lacking any with "'able guifts and fitness'" to serve as pastor, may and ought to appoint some of its members to prophesy and teach the Word; however, as soon as possible the church should "'elect and ordain suitable persons for pastor and teacher,'" as the others could not administer the sacraments.[3] The exiles in Holland seem to have followed this practice until Francis Johnson, whom Clapham called "'the Bishop of Brownisme,'"[4] was released from prison and joined them

1. Ut per Price, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 484-485.
2. Ibid., p. 487.
3. "A Trve Confession of the Faith," etc., Articles 34, 35, 23. Vide Henry Martyn Dexter, Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, As Seen In Its Literature (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1879), 278-282.
4. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 158.

in the fall of 1597, when he was ordained their pastor.[1] In March 1603, they petitioned the new king for permission to live in their native land without being urged to use or to approve "'any remnants of poperie & humane traditions.'" In a supplementary Confession, they defined their church as "'a company of people called and separated from the world by the word of God, and joyned together by voluntarie profession of the faith of Christ, in the fellowship of the Gospell,'" and declared

> 'that discreet, faithfull, and able men (though not yet in office of Ministerie) may be appointed to preach the gospell, and whole truth of God, that men being first brought to knowledge, and converted to the Lord, may then be ioyned together in holy communion with Christ our head and one with another.'[2]

In a third supplication they prayed the king that his own "'naturall loving subiects shall fynd no lesse favour'" in his sight than the French and Dutch congregations which he tolerated in London; however, these petitions brought only attacks upon them from some Oxford doctors,[3] and their hopes of returning home dimned. Many of their sympathizers who had remained in England and had waited upon the new king now decided to join the exiles. A company of twelve or thirteen, led by Thomas White, came from the West of England and united with Johnson's church at Amsterdam; a more important group came, in 1608, from Gainsborough.

In many ways John Smyth and John Robinson exemplify the religious travail and progress of their age. As graduates and fellows of Cambridge, they had intimate contacts with such Puritan leaders as Perkins, Chaderton and Hildersham. Both of them avoided "taking a living" where

1. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 157.
2. Ut per Dexter, op. cit., pp. 306-307.
3. Vide Dexter, op. cit., pp. 309-310.

the bishop of the diocese could harry them into uniformity;[1] instead they became lecturers at Lincoln and Norwich, where they were supported by those who wished to supplement the official ministrations of the Church and to encourage Puritan preaching. In 1602 Smyth was replaced because he had never received a preaching-license from the bishop (although he had been ordained in 1594); in 1603/4 Robinson was suspended. Smyth's writings at this time indicate he was moderate in his Puritanism; he admitted the need of bishops to govern, approved set forms of prayer, upheld the magistrate's right to enforce proper worship, rebuked his former tutor, Francis Johnson, for separating from the Church and joined in the common condemnation of the Anabaptists.[2] However, the disappointment which the Puritans experienced at Hampton Court caused many to rethink their position; Puritan ministers all over the country gathered in secret conferences to decide what to do. Whitley says:

> Smyth was quite clear-sighted enough to recognize that the years of winking and tolerance were over, and that it was needful either to conform or to separate. He took the bold line that the result of Hampton Court and the new canons was to refuse all reformation, that it revealed the Church of England as an institution corrupt, and contentedly corrupt, with ministers corrupt, worship corrupt; therefore that it behoved every man who would not himself be corrupted, to linger no longer but depart out of Babylon.[3]

Turning to the New Testament for the pattern of church polity, he came to define a church as

> 'a visible communion of Saincts . . . of two, three, or moe Saincts joyned together by covenant with God & themselves, freely to vse al the holy things of God, according to the word, for their mutual edification, & Gods glory.'[4]

1. Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 34; Dexter, op. cit., p. 376.
2. Vide Works of John Smyth, ed., with notes and biography by W. T. Whitley, (Tercentenary ed., 2 vols., Cambridge: University Press, 1915), I, 158, 165, 166.
3. Vide Ibid., vol. I, "Biography," p. lviii.
4. Ibid., p. 252.

While only the pastor and teacher of such a church had the power to administer the Sacraments, preaching or prophesying was by no means confined to them; describing the members received into communion as first Prophets and secondly private persons, Smyth writes:

> Prophets are men endued with gifts apt to vtter matter fit to edification, exhortation, and consolation. 1 Cor. 14,3, Act. 13, 1, Rom. 12.6.
>
> These persons must first be appointed to this exercise by the church. 1 Cor. 14, 40, Act, 13.1
>
> The Prophets care must be to prophecy according to the proportiō of faith. Rō. 12, 6, 1 Cor. 14, 26.
>
> Let the Prophets speak two or three and let the rest judge 1 Cor. 14, 29
>
> If any thing be revealed to him that sitteth by let the first hold his peace 1 Cor. 14, 30, 40.
>
> All that have gifts may be admitted to prophecy 1 Cor. 14. 31,
>
> Private persons are 1 men 2. weomen
>
> Private men present at the exercise of prophecy may modestly propound their doubts which are to be resolved by the prophets: Luk. 2, 46, 47, 1 Sam. 19, 20-23. 1 Cor. 14, 30.
>
> Weomen are not permitted to speak in the church in tyme of prophecy. 1 Cor. 14. 34. 1 Tim. 2. 12. Revel. 2, 20.
>
> If women doubt of any thing delivered in tyme of prophecy and are willing to learn, they must ask them that can teach them in private, as their husbands at home if they be faithful, or some other of the church. 1 Cor. 14,35. 1 Tim 2, 12.
>
> To this exercise of prophecy may be admitted vnbeleevers or they that are without. 1 Cor. 14,24. Act, 2,6,13.
>
> The exercise of prophecy, and the preaching of the word by them that are sent, is that ordinary meanes God hath appointed to convert men. 1 Cor. 14,24.25, Rom. 10,14,15.
>
> They are sent by God to preach whō the church sendeth Act. 13, 2-4. & 8,14.15.[1]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The prophets cheef care must be to resolve doubts, difficulties, and dark places, & to give true expositions, translations & reconciliations of scripture. 1 Cor. 14.26.30. Luk. 2, 46.47.
>
> The office of the pastor and teacher in the exercise of prophecie is to moderate and determine all matters out of the word. 1 Cor. 14.32. I Sam. 19.20.[2]

Burrage suggests that Smyth and those of his opinion at first might have met as Puritan members of the Church of England, but in the beginning of

1. Smyth, Works, vol. I, pp. 255-256.
2. Ibid., p. 261.

the year 1605/6 they decided to separate and to form a church of their own.[1] Governor Bradford describes this important decision in these words:

> 'They shooke of this yoake of antichristian bondage, and as ye Lords free people, loyned them selves (by a covenant of the Lord) into a church estate, in y^e^ fellowship of y^e^ gospel, to walke in all his wayes, made known, or to be made known unto them, according to their best endeavours, whatsoever it should cost them, the Lord assisting them.'[2]

In 1608 Smyth wrote that it was their covenant "to forsake every evill way whither in opinion or practise that shalbe manifested vnto vs at any tyme."[3] After denouncing his ordination by Bishop Wickham, Smyth was elected and ordained pastor, and soon John Robinson joined to assist him.[4] Sometime toward the close of 1605 or early 1606[5] the church became "'2 distincte bodys or churches, & in regarde of distance of place did congregate severally;'"[6] Smyth and Helwys remained at Gainsborough, while Clyfton and Robinson went to Scrooby. In July of 1607 three of their members were arrested; according to Bradford,

> 'others had their houses besett and watcht night and day, and hardly escaped their hands; and the most were fain to fly and leave their houses and habitation, and the means of their livelihood.'[7]

Already the new world was challenging them, but there was no time to make plans to go there; Holland had been a haven for others, and so "'by a joynte consente they resolved to goe into ye Low Countries,

1. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 230-231.
2. Vide Smyth, Works, vol. I, "Biography," lxii.
3. Smyth, Works, vol. I, p. 271.
4. Vide Dexter, op. cit., pp. 377-378; Smyth, Works, "Biography," p. lxviii.
5. Dale, op. cit., p. 196.
6. Bradford, ut per Dexter, op. cit., p. 379.
7. Bradford, ut per Dale, op. cit., p. 196.

wher they heard was freedome of Religion for all men.'"[1] The group from Gainsborough arrived in Amsterdam in July of 1608; the second group from Scrooby arrived towards the end of the same year and moved on to Leyden.

Apparently Smyth's group never joined the "Ancient Church" in Amsterdam, for soon the two groups were debating their differences. Smyth argued that as New Testament worship is spiritual "proceeding originally from the hart" no books should be used in prophesying or singing; believing that all the elders were pastors, he rejected "the triformed Presbyterie;" he held that only church members should contribute to the church treasury.[2] In an undated letter, Hughe and Anne Bromheade give the following account of the service in Smyth's church:

> 'The order of the worshippe and government of oure church is. 1. we begynne with A prayer, after reade some one or two chapters of the bible gyve the sence therof, and conferr vpon the same, that done we lay aside oure bookes, and after a solemne prayer made by the. 1. speaker, he propoundeth some text owt of the Scripture, and prophecieth owt of the same, by the space of one hower, or thre Quarters of an hower. After him standeth vp A. 2. speaker and prophecieth owt of the said text the like tyme and space. some tyme more some tyme lesse. After him the .3. the .4. the .5. &c as the tyme will geve leave, Then the .1. speaker concludeth with prayer as he began with prayer, with an exhortation to contribution to the poore, which collection being made is also concluded with prayer. This Morning exercise begynes at eight of the clock (e?) and continueth vnto twelve of the clocke the like course of exercise is observed in the aft (er)-n (o) wne from .2. of the clocke vnto .5. or .6. of the Clocke. last of all the execution of the g [over] ment of the church is handled.'[3]

The order of worship for the "ancient church," of which Johnson was

1. Bradford, up per Dexter, op. cit., p. 380.
2. Smyth, Works, vol. I, p. 273. Vide Ibid., vol. II, p. 755.
3. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 236.

pastor, is described by Mr. Clyfton as follows:

> '1. Prayer and giving of thanks by the pastor or teacher.
> 2. The Scriptures are read, two or three chapters, as time serves, with a brief explanation of their meaning.
> 3. The pastor or teacher then takes some passage of Scripture, and expounds and enforces it.
> 4. The sacraments are administered.
> 5. Some of the Psalms of David are sung by the whole congregation, both before and after the exercise of the Word.
> 6. Collection is then made, as each one is able, for the support of the officers and the poor.'[1]

Of these differences, Smyth wrote:

> And lett no man bee offended at vs for that wee differ from the auncient brethren of the seperation in the Leitourgie Presbyterie & Treasurie of the Church: for wee hold not our fayth at any mans pleasure or in respect of persons, neyther doe wee bynd our selves to walk according to other mens lynes further then they walk in the truth. . . . But as Paull withstood Peter to his face & seperated from Barnabas that good man that was full of the holy ghost & of fayth, for just causses: So must they give vs leave to love the truth & honour the Lord more then any man or Church vppon earth.[2]

Although he had answered Smyth's writings against Johnson, Ainsworth came to differ with his pastor in regards to the authority of the elders; Johnson believed that the authority of the church was surrendered into the hands of the elders upon their election and that the church should abide by their decisions, while Ainsworth sided with Smyth in upholding the supremacy of the people over their representatives. This difference led to the formation of a fourth Separatist Church in Holland. While they differed on many points, they all agreed in the independence of each congregation, with power to elect and ordain it own officers; Barclay says:

> The fullest liberty of prophesying or preaching was conceded in all these churches, to members not in office, and there was a period set apart after the pastor and teacher had both exercised

1. Richard Clyfton, "An Advertisement concerning a Book," &c. (1612). Vide Works of John Robinson, ed Robert Ashton, (3 vols., London: John Snow, 1851), III, 485.
2. Smyth, Works, vol. I, pp. 271-272.

> their ministry. In the middle of the week also, there was a meeting for this purpose, when even persons not belonging to the Church might prophesy or preach.[1]

Henoch Clapham accused the exiled Separatists of permitting "'indifelious Marchantes to come on the Thursday unto their exercise of prophesyings.'"[2]

Having left the Church of England as a false Church and having repudiated the ordination he had received from the bishop, Smyth came to question the validity of its baptism and then the validity of all infant-baptism, concluding that the Scriptures warrant only a believer's baptism. Being convinced that their former baptism was invalid, thereby nullifying their covenant at Gainsborough, Smyth and his followers disbanded their church; as private individuals unbaptized, Smyth first baptized himself and then baptized the others.[3] In criticism of his se-baptism, Hetherington said to Smyth:"'It was wonder that you would not receive your baptisme first from some one of the Elders of the Dutch Anabaptists,'" which saying caused Smyth to turn to those whom he once had scorned.[4] In this step Smyth lost some of his most faithful followers; Helwys and Murton were offended that Smyth should now seek 'a succession in the ministry.' Helwys reasoned that if only elders could baptize, then only elders could ordain; he asked:

> 'Hath the Lord thus restrained His Spirit, His Word and ordinances as to make particular men lords over them, or keepers of them? God forbid. This is contrary to the liberty of the

1. Barclay, op. cit., p. 101. However, Barclay later informs us that Mr. Simpson's Church did not allow this liberty and that Mr. Bridge separated from him on this issue. Vide Ibid., pp. 103-105.

2. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., p. 101.

3. Vide Smyth, Works, vol. I, pp. xcii-xcv. Also Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 221-226. Smyth was not the first of the exiles to take this course, but he did so independently of the others and with far more significance. Vide Ibid.

4. Vide Smyth, Works, vol. I, "Biography," pp. cvii-cviii.

Gospel, which is free for all men, at all times and in all places.'[1]

Smyth, however, was not to be deterred; in his negotiations with the Waterlanders, Smyth drew up what might be reckoned as the first English Baptist Confession (1610?), which reveals that Smyth and his followers had already repudiated Calvinism and held that God had created man with freedom to choose good or evil, that Christ's death was to reconcile all men to God and that it was each man's choice which decided his fate.[2] Helwys made no objection to this "general salvation;" however, he was sceptical of the Hoffmannite Christology and was opposed to the succession-concept. Nevertheless, thirty-one members followed Smyth in acknowledging their error in making an independent beginning and applied to the Mennonites to receive them into "'a true Church of Christ;'"[3] Helwys and ten others sadly and reluctantly parted company with the man for whom they considered "'all our love too little.'"[4] In further elaboration of their confession, Smyth declared:

> That the magistrate is not by vertue of his office to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience, to force and compell men to this or that form of religion, or doctrine: but to leaue Christian religion free, to euery mans conscience, and to handle onely ciuil transgressions Rom. 13. iniuries and wronges of men against man, in murther, Adulterie, theft etc. for Christ onelie is the king, and lawgiuer of the church and conscience Jas 4.12.[5]

This was the first expression of the doctrine of the separation of church and state, which was to become so vital a part of the Baptist

1. Ut per Underwood, op. cit., p. 39.
2. Vide Smyth, Works, vol. II, pp. 682-684.
3. Knappen says this application, which is still in the Mennonite Archives in Amsterdam, is "the first discoverable tie between the English Separatists and the Anabaptists." Tudor Puritanism, p. 330.
4. Vide Dexter, op. cit., pp. 323-324.
5. Smyth, Works, vol. II, p. 748.

tradition; it was also "the first claim for full religious liberty ever penned in the English language."[1] Of it Jordan says:

> It is evident that Smyth had renounced completely the philosophical bases of persecution and that, despite the intense evangelical zeal of the Baptists, he would spread religious truth among unbelievers only with the spiritual agencies in which he reposed such complete confidence.[2]

In the summer of 1612, Smyth began his last work, "The Retraction of His Errours and the Confirmation of the Truth," in which he answered Helwys' harsh charges with these fine words:

> I deny all sucessiō except in the truth: and I hold wee are not to violate the order of the primitiue church, except Necessitie vrge a dispensation: and therfore it is not lawfull for euery one that seeth the truth to baptise, for then ther might be as manie churches as couples in the world and none haue anie thinge to doe with other: which breaketh the bonde of loue and Brotherhood in churches, but in these outward matters I dare not anie more contend with anie man but desire that we may follow the truth of Repentance, faith and regeneration, ād lay aside dissention.[3]

Repenting that he had so long cumbered himself with such matters, he said:

> That difference in Judgement for matter of circumstance, as are all things of the outward church, shall not cause me to refuse the brotherhood of anie penitent and faithfull Christian whatsoever. And now from this day forward do I putt an end to all controversies and questions, about the outward church and ceremonies with all men: and resolve to sped my time, in the mayne matters wherin consisteth salvation.[4]

Smyth, of whom Mandell Creighton said, "'None of the English Separatists had a finer mind or a more beautiful soul,'"[5] died in August of 1612; his immediate company finally united with the Waterlanders, while Helwys led his group back to London where, at the end of 1612, they founded the first Baptist Church in England.

1. Underwood, op. cit., p. 42.
2. Jordan, op. cit., vol. II, p. 273.
3. Smyth, Works, vol. II, p. 758.
4. Ibid., p. 755.
5. Ut per Whitley, Smyth's Works, vol. I, p. cxvii. Dexter, op. cit., p. 323.

John Robinson, whom Bradford described as a man "'of solid judgment, . . . of a quick and sharp wit . . . of a tender conscience,'" who would search thoroughly in every argument until he reached the bottom,[1] differed with both Johnson and Smyth on several points, but he agreed with them on the liberty of private-men's prophesying. In his "Justification of Separation from the Church of England," (1610) the pastor of the Leyden congregation defends that kind of preaching which "we call prophesying" (Rom. 12:6), on behalf of all those who have a gift thereunto "though not yet called into the office of ministry."[2] Not only may such gifts be used in the church for edification, exhortation, and comfort" (I Cor. 14:3), but they should be used. Num. 11:29; II Chron. 17:7; Jer. 1:4-5; Matt. 10:1-5; Luke 8: 39, 10:1-3, 9; John 4: 28-29, 39; Acts 8:1-4, 11:19-21; I Peter 4: 10-11; Rev. 11:3, 14:6. The Apostle Paul (I Cor. 14) "intends the establishing of, and so takes order, and gives direction for an ordinary constant exercise in the church, even by men out of office."[3] Robinson cites this liberty in "the ordinance of prophecy" to prove that the church as a whole has liberty in "the ordinance of excommunication," and concludes that "brethren, though not in office, have not their hands tied from meddling in the affairs of the church."[4]

In 1618, Robinson elaborated his defense of private-men's prophesying, which Ashton says may be designated in modern times as "lay-preaching."[5] Upon reading the notes sent to him of the Rev.

1. Ut per Dale, op. cit., 206.
2. Robinson, Works, vol. II, pp. 246-247.
3. Ibid., pp. 247-248.
4. Ibid., pp. 250-251.
5. Vide Robinson, Works, vol. III, "Prefatory Notice", p. 283.

John Yates' treatise on "Persons Prophesying out of office,"

> the solicitudes of the expatriated minister of Norwich were revived, and he resolved on publishing for the benefit of his former friends in that city, a Defence both of Lay-preaching in general, as a substitute for official ministrations when such could not be obtained, and of the practice which was not uncommon among the early Independents, of allowing any gifted brother who felt disposed, to arise and speak at the close of the minister's discourse.[1]

"The People's Plea for the Exercise of Prophecy, Against Mr. John Yates His Monopolie" (1618) was the first of many publications devoted to this subject of private-men's prophesying or preaching; as it was the parent and pattern of many others, it will be profitable for us to consider it in detail. Judging Mr. Yates to be "a man sincerely zealous for the truth," Robinson conscientiously examines his thesis, point by point, and prays that all who see the truth may find it and "therein accord in all things."[2] Mr. Yates' thesis was: "to prove ordinary prophecy in public, out of office, unlawful," for which he presented ten arguments which we may condense, with Robinson's answers, as follows:[3]

> Yates' First Argument: From the commission of Christ. All prophecy in public is to remit and retain sins, which power Christ grants only to those whom He sends and ordains thereunto (Jno. 20: 21-23). "But men out of office are neither sent nor ordained thereunto, therefore in public ought not to meddle with the power of the

1. Robinson, Works, vol. III, "Prefatory Notice" p. 283. Ashton makes this interesting comment: "Lay-preaching had long been a controverted subject among various parties. The Congregationalists themselves have not always been agreed respecting its validity and expediency. Generally, however, it has been allowed and encouraged by them, as a means of supplying the lack of ministerial service."

2. Ibid., pp. 285-286.

3. All direct quotations in this passage are marked with quotation marks; otherwise, this is a summary or condensation, although it is single-spaced. This is contrary to the practice heretofore used in this thesis, but it is hoped that such will prove helpful in reading this long passage.

keys." The examples of men, in the Scriptures, who prophesied out of office were extraordinary cases of men who acted by "the secret motion of the Spirit," and, therefore, were outside the rule.

Robinson's Answer: If Christ had granted the power of remitting and retaining sins to none except to such as He sent, then He would have granted it to none except to the Apostles, but the Scriptures plainly state that this power is granted (1) to ordinary pastors (Eph. 4:8-12), (2) to the whole Church gathered together (Matt. 18: 17-18), (3) and to every faithful brother, confessing Jesus Christ (Matt. 16:18-19). Unto whom the Word is given, unto him the power of binding and loosing sins is given, for such comes only by way of declaring and manifesting the Word. The "secret motion of the Spirit" is but the prophet's zeal for God's glory and for man's good. He who has received gifts, whether ordinary or extraordinary, has "warrant sufficient from his zeal to God's glory, and man's salvation, to use the same gift in his time, place, and order."[1]

Yates' Second Argument: From the execution of a public function in the church. Ordinary prophecy is only preaching the glad tidings of peace to God's people, but the apostle says it is not warrantable without being sent. (Rom. 10:15).

Robinson's Answer: We have no need of a geneology from the Pope of Rome; nor do "our prophets" need as solemn a calling as do our constant ministers. The "sending" by Christ was of those in office, but others out of office were not excluded form using their gifts, as is shown in the practice of the Jewish synagogues and early Christian churches where after the public ministry had ended others who had "a gift to speak to the edification of the hearers" were exhorted to use the same. (Acts 13:14-15).[2]

Yates' Third Argument: From the true causes of prophecy in the New Testament, which are two, either immediate revelation, or imposition of hands (Acts 2:17 and Acts 8:17). Any other cause of public prophecy is unwarrantable by the Scriptures.

Robinson's Answer: What of Christ's breathing upon the apostles (John 20:22) and the descent of the cloven fiery tongues (Acts 2: 3-4)? As for the imposition of hands , it is "no more than a sign denoting the person, not a cause effecting the thing." "The gift of prophecy comes not by the office, but being found in persons before, makes them capable of the office by due means."[3]

Yates' Fourth Argument: From distinction of spiritual gifts, administrations, and operations (I Cor. 12:4-6). No one will deny but that some gifts were extraordinary; Yates seeks to prove that all gifts listed in I Cor. 12:8-10 were extraordinary.

Robinson's Answer: Some of the gifts (I Cor. 12) were extra-ordinary, but others were ordinary. Surely teachers were ordinary officers and helpers and governors likely were only deacons and elders. In verse 3 the apostle says that no man can call Jesus the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost, which is a gift and grace of the Spirit, "ordinary and common to all Christians." Verse 8 mentions

1. Robinson, Works, vol. III, pp. 288-290.
2. Ibid., pp. 290-292.
3. Ibid., pp. 292-293.

the word of wisdom and the word of knowledge which are ordinary gifts of ordinary persons, both in and out of office now and then; verse 2 compares the church to a body having Christ as the head and each member as a part, wherein their gifts may vary but all are given of God for their mutual good.[1]

Yates' Fifth Argument: From comparison of prophecy and strange tongues, which are laid together through all of I Cor. 14. Prophecy in the Corinth church could not have been ordinary, because it was to be preferred above all other spiritual gifts (I Cor. 12:31) and all other gifts were given for its good.

Robinson's Answer: If prophecy had been extraordinary, immediate and miraculous, the Corinthians likely would have preferred it above the tongues which they did consider extraordinary. The Apostle preferred prophecy before tongues because it was more profitable and edifying.[2]

Yates' Sixth Argument: From exemplification. In I Cor. 14:6, the Apostle "puts revelation first, as the cause of all the rest, which shows plainly he speaks of such prophecy as came by revelation, for revelation brings a man knowledge, and knowledge teacheth wholesome doctrine, and prophecy serveth to utter it."

Robinson's Answer: Yates' observation about revelation is "true and good in itself," but there can be in the church revelations other than that which is extraordinary; there can be an ordinary spirit of teaching wherein revelation can be given.[3]

Yates' Seventh Argument: From the fruition of spiritual gifts. (I Cor. 14:26). The making of psalms and doctrine in the Corinthian Church were the immediate work of the Spirit as were the strange tongues and their interpretation; otherwise the Corinthians would have had to study the rules of meter as well as books of theology and foreign languages.

Robinson's Answer: The Scriptures insinuate the contrary (Eph. 5:18-19, Col. 3:16, James 5:13). Corinth was noted for its culture, arts and learning; it should not be strange that there were many in the church who were gifted in these matters, which gifts Paul encouraged them to use to the glory of God.[4]

Yates' Eighth Argument: From present revelation. In I Cor. 14:30 the apostle enjoins silence to one speaker when another receives inspiration or revelation; if prophesying should have been an ordinary product of study, there would have been no need for such an interruption.

Robinson's Answer: Neither would there have been any need of interruption had the Corinthian prophets spoken by immediate inspiration of the Spirit; it is more appropriate that ordinary prophets be rebuked for thinking that the Spirit had been given to them alone than for extraordinary prophets, who could not err, be called down for monopolizing all the time. The apostle did not require a rude interruption but "a convenient cession or place-giving to a second" who was equally as gifted as the first. Whereas

1. Robinson, Works, vol. III, pp. 293-300.
2. Ibid., pp. 300-302.
3. Ibid., pp. 302-303.
4. Ibid., pp. 303-306.

in the early church it was not thought a disgrace for several to speak, now when the servants of the church have become its masters, one must monopolize all the teaching or speaking, which was the very disease which the apostle was trying to heal in the Corinth Church. A preacher should have the modesty to conceive that the Spirit might reveal something to someone other than himself. Matt. 11:25, Eph. 1:7-12, Phil. 3:15 prove that there is in the church "an ordinary Spirit of revelation."[1]

Yates' Ninth Argument: From vocation. In I Cor. 14:29, 32, 37, spiritual men are called prophets; they had either an immediate calling from God or a calling mediated from men, which callings we grant lawful. Those who take it upon themselves to prophesy have neither, and therefore their preaching is unlawful. The servant of Moses thought that Eldad and Medad had no lawful calling, whereas Moses knew that they had been called of God and wished that the like gift might be upon all of God's people (Num. 11:28-29).

Robinson's Answer: Is it not the gift of prophesy which makes the prophet, whether ordinary or extraordinary? Therefore, those who have an ordinary gift or ability to prophesy are prophets, although they have no office. Mr. Yates rightly apportioneth the prophesying of Eldad and Medad to their gifts, which is all that is argued for "our prophets." (Rom. 12:6-7). "We affirm that our prophets have a calling . . . not to make them prophets by condition or estate, . . . but for the use or exercise of the same gift before bestowed upon them by the Lord, through their labour and industry."[2]

Yates' Tenth Argument: From distinction. In I Cor. 14:37 the apostle, in speaking to the prophets and spiritual men, plainly shows that "these had some particular place over the rest;" to set men in public office without a proper calling would bring confusion and disorder into the church.

Robinson's Answer: This argument is founded upon the groundless presumption that in the church there is no lawful calling of prophesying for gifted men who are out of office; Paul's words to the prophets (verse 37) show that the prophets were "above the rest after a sort" as those who are endowed of the Spirit are among us.[3]

After his "confirmation of the Scriptures," Robinson makes this interesting observation:

> It is not only permitted as lawful, but required as necessary where I live, that such as have bent their thoughts towards the ministry, should beforehand use their gifts publicly in the church; an intolerable bondage it would be thought by them to have pastors ordained for them, . . . whose ability in teaching they had not taken former experience.[4]

1. Robinson, Works, vol. III, pp. 306-308.
2. Ibid., pp. 308-309.
3. Ibid., p. 309.
4. Ibid., p. 334.

Robinson concludes with a prayer that the Lord will give his people courage to stand for this liberty and grace to use the same "unto his glory, in our mutual edification.[1]

Charged with having "all and every member of the church a prophet," Robinson explains their practice more fully in his "Just and Necessary Apology," etc. which was first written in 1619 but printed in English in 1625.

> We learn from the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 3, that 'he who prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edification, exhortation, and comfort:' which to perform conveniently, and as becomes the church assembly, we may account comes within the compass but of a few of the multitude; happily two or three in each of our churches, considering their weak and depressed state. Touching prophecy then we think the very same, that the synod held at Embden, 1571, hath decreed in these words: '1. In all churches, whether but springing up, or grown to some ripeness, let the order of prophecy be observed, according to Paul's institution. 2. Into the fellowship of this work are to be admitted not only the ministers, but the teachers too, as also the elders and deacons, yea, even of the multitude, which are willing to confer their gift received of God, to the common utility of the church: but so as they first be allowed by the judgment of the ministers, and others.' Harm. Synod. Belg. pp. 21,22 And as the apostle sometimes said, 'We believe, and therefore we speak,' 2 Cor. iv.13, so because we believe with the Beligic churches, that this exercise is to be observed in all congregations, therefore we also observe it in ours.[2]

Robinson gives three main reasons or foundations for their practice, the first of which he "fetches" from the example of the Jewish Church which gave liberty both for teaching and disputing publicly in synagogue and temple to all gifted or "wise" men without any respect to office; thus while the Jews did not accept Christ's authority, they permitted Christ and his apostles to "say on." (Luke 2:46-47, 4:15-16; Acts 8:4, 11:19-21, 13:14-16, 18:24-26).[3] For his second "foundation," Robinson cites

1. Robinson, Works, vol. III, p. 335.
2. Ibid., p. 55.
3. Ibid., pp. 55-56.

I Cor. 14, where the Apostle Paul instructs the church at Corinth in the order of the prophesying exercise which they had formerly violated; Beza and Peter Martyr said that as this order had proven of so much good in the synagogues that the apostle did not hesitate to transfer it to the church of Christ. To Robinson it seems improbable that the Corinthian prophets were of extraordinary gifts as: (1) there were many of this rank in one church (I Cor. 14:24, 29, 31); (2) they had "behaved themselves inordinately in the church" and were subject to errors (verses 29, 32); (3) women were enjoined to be silent, which would have been contrary to the examples of the prophesying of extraordinarily gifted women, Exodus 15:21, Judges 5:1, II Kings 22:14, Luke 2:36, Rev. 2:20; (4) the apostle upbraids them as do not speak the Work of God (I Cor. 14:36).[1] Robinson finds a third "foundation" for their practice of prophesying in "the most excellent ends attainable only by this means."

> 1. That 'God may be glorified, whilst every one doth administer to another the gift which he hath received, as good dispensers of the manifold grace of God.' I Pet. iv. 10,11.
> 2. That 'the Spirit be not extinguished,' 1 Thess. v. 19,20, that is, the gift of prophecy, or teaching; in which it may so come to pass, that some in the church, though no ministers, may excel the very pastors themselves.
> 3. That such as are to be taken into the ministry of the church, may both become and appear 'apt to teach.' 1 Tim. i.3. This seeing, the apostle would have done, he would questionless have some order for the doing of it; which, excepting this of prophecy, we have none of apostolical institution.
> 4. That the doctrine of the church may be preserved pure, from the infection of error: which is far more easily corrupted, when some one or two alone in the church speak all, and all the rest have deep and perpetual silence enjoined them. 1 John iv. 1; Rev. ii. 2,7, with i. 11.
> 5. That things doubtful arising in teaching may be cleared, things obscure opened, things erroneous convinced; and lastly, that as by the beating together of two stones fire appeareth, so may

1. Robinson, Works, vol. III, p. 57.

the light of the truth more clearly shine by disputations, questions, and answers modestly had and made, and as becomes the church of saints, and work of God. Luke ii.40; iv.21,22; Acts xvii.2; xviii.24, 26, 28.

6. For the edification of the church, and conversion of them that believe not: and this the rather because it appertaineth not properly to the pastors, as pastors, to turn goats or wolves into sheep, but rather to feed the flock and sheep of Christ, in which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers. 1 Cor. xiv.4,24,25; Acts xx.28.

7. And lastly, Lest by excluding the commonalty and multitude from church affairs, the people of God be divided, and charity lessened, and familiarity and good-will be extinguished between the order of ministers and people.[1]

Robinson attempted to answer yet another kind of criticism of the exiled Separatists, and his failure led to important consequences. In 1612, Thomas Helwys, who had repented of his flight from England and who had returned to the home-land to establish the first English Baptist Church on English soil, published "A Short Declaration of the Mistery of Iniquity," which rebuked those who remained in exile while "'thousands of ignorant souls in our own country were perishing for lack of instruction.'"[2] "Forced by the unreasonable provocation of Mr. Thomas Helwisse, who in great confidence and passion layeth load of reproaches both upon our flight in persecution, and also upon our persons for it,"[3] Robinson replied by appealing to the numerous instances of flight in the Scriptures. In 1615, another tract answered that these examples had been only for such a time as when there was no work required; bemoaning the spiritual impoverishment of the home land, the tract pointedly concludes with these words:

'If any of these men can prove that the Lord requireth no work at their hands to be done for His glory, and the salvation

1. Robinson, Works, vol. III, p. 58.
2. Ut per Underwood, op. cit., p. 46.
3. Robinson, Works, vol. III, pp. 155-156.

> of thousands of ignorant souls in their own nation, let them stay in foreign countries.'[1]

Henry Jacob, a prominent member in Robinson's church, was persuaded to return to England, where in 1616 at Southwark he established what "is reputed to be the mother-church of the Independent denomination."[2] Those who remained behind in Leyden began to re-examine their position; they realized that their children were being influenced by the people around them and that they would soon be lost to England. As they could not practice their religion in England, they resolved to go to "Virginia" where they could, at least, serve as "stepping-stones" unto others for the propagation and advancement of the gospel in those remote parts of the world.[3] After many delays, the negotiations with the authorities in England were completed, and on July 21, 1620 the first company took leave of their beloved pastor who vainly hoped to join them later. In his parting words he expressed one of the noblest sentiments of the old Separatists:

> '. . . I charge you before God and his blessed angels, that you follow me no farther than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. If God reveals anything to you, by any other instrument of his, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry: for I am verily persuaded, the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word.'[4]

In many ways the "dear England" to which the Pilgrims bade farewell in 1620 was much the same as they had known in their childhood and youth; Trevelyan says that in regard to social and economic conditions the reigns of both the early Stuarts may be described as "an uneventful

1. "Objections Answered," ut per Dale, op. cit., pp. 212-213.
2. Dexter, op. cit., p. 635.
3. Bradford, ut per Dale, op. cit., pp. 204-205.
4. Ut per Neal, op. cit., pp. 490-491. Vide Dictionary of National Biography, vol. xlix, p. 21.

prolongation of the Elizabethan era."[1] The developments in agriculture, industry and commerce all continued to follow the Tudor patterns: the country gentlemen continued to grow in importance; the trading companies continued to increase their wealth and influence; London continued its development as the head of the nation.

> In the country at large, the apprentice system, the poor law, the regulation of wages and prices, the economic and administrative functions of the Justices of the Peace under the control and stimulus of the Privy Council, were all much the same on the day when the Long Parliament met as on the day when Queen Elizabeth died. No industrial, agricultural or social change of importance took place in England during the forty years when the Parliamentary and Puritan Revolution was germinating beneath the soil of an apparently stable and settled society.[2]

When the Mayflower sailed, Shakespeare had been dead for four years; his genius reached its peak in the first years of King James' reign, and in 1611 he had retired to Stratford-on-Avon. About the time he was bidding fare-well to the stage, there appeared another factor which would have even greater influence in the cultural and literary life of England—the authorized translation of the Bible. Although it bore this statement on its title-page "newly translated out of the original tongues, and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by his Majesty's special commandment," there seems to have been no authorization other than what was said at the Hampton Court Conference; it was never submitted to Parliament or any convocation or the Privy Council.[3] Nevertheless, this new version seems to have made its own way, gradually winning the hearts of the people; it was truly "one principall good one" out of many translations, and within forty years it had become the supreme

1. Trevelyan, Social History, p. 206.
2. Ibid.
3. Vide Anderson, op. cit., vol. II, p. 386.

one.[1] The people believed the claim made in the Translators' preface that the original scriptures are

> from heaven, not from earth; the authour being God, not man; the enditer, the holy spirit, not the wit of the Apostles or Prophets; the Pen-men such as were sanctified from the wombe, and endewed with a principall protion of Gods spirit. . . .[2]

And they read the Good Book, as no other book has ever been read. Trevelyan says:

> For every Englishman who had read Sidney or Spenser, or had seen Shakespeare acted at the Globe, there were hundreds who had read or heard the Bible with close attention as the word of God. The effect of the continual domestic study of the book upon the national character, imagination and intelligence for nearly three centuries to come, was greater than that of any literary movement in our annals, or any religious movement since the coming of St. Augustine. New worlds of history and poetry were opened in its pages to a people that had little else to read. Indeed it created the habit of reading and reflection in whole classes of the community, and turned a tinker into one of the great masters of the English tongue.[3]

The Word was not only read, it was also preached; Mitchell describes the seventeenth century as, "par excellence an age of sermons." In addition to its religious function the pulpit served the place now taken by the journalistic press and broadcasting company; its influence was enormous.[4] Great audiences attended the preaching of such men as Lancelot Andrewes, who, according to Frere, "combined wit with learning, and a singular gift of exposition with an ideal pulpit style."[5] The sermons of the Anglican preachers were characterized by their many quotations in Latin, Greek and Hebrew and many citations from the Fathers, which

1. Vide "Preface to Christian Reader", Pollard Records, p. 369. For the names of translators and their story, vide: Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 227-228; Anderson, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 364-394.
2. Preface to the Version of 1611, Pollard, Records, p. 348.
3. Trevelyan, Hist.of Engl. p. 367.
4. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 3.
5. Frere, op. cit., p. 343.

served to illustrate the preacher's learning rather than to teach any new lesson;[1] the sermons of the Puritan preachers, on the other hand, were characterized by their many scriptural references and their illustrations taken from life; they were in the habit of preaching more directly to their hearers. Mitchell says,

> the early Puritans were Elizabethans, with that full-blooded relish for a variegated life which characterised the dramatists and pamphleteers of the age, and the topical onslaughts of Puritan preachers strike at times much the same note as the more serious of the latter.[2]

In some quarters it was popular to ridicule the Puritan preacher; at the king's court, on the night of November 1, 1614, there was presented a new play by Ben Johnson, which G. Gregory Smith describes as "a satire, alike on the Puritans and on the stage trashery they condemned in their own narrow unliterary way."[3] However, "Bartholomew Fair" may be called a satire on Brownism or Separatism, for in it we find ridicule of certain "Brownist" features, such as, prophesying by the Spirit, hostility to worldliness, the fellowship of saints and the lawful calling of its ministers. The main butt of Johnson's wit is Rabbi Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, a baker from Banbury who has turned "prophet" and who is rival with Winwife for the hand of a wealthy widow, Dame Purecraft, who is a sister of the sanctified assembly. When Dame Purecraft asks if her daughter, who is pregnant, might go to the fair to satisfy her craving to eat pig, Rabbi Busy, after much persuasion, concludes that she might if she eats with "a reformed mouth." Rabbi Busy shepherds his company to the pig-woman's tent where

1. Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 204-205.
2. Ibid., pp. 198-199.
3. G. Gregory Smith, Ben Johnson (English Men of Letters, London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1919), 116.

he eats exceedingly, after which he begins to prophesy:

> I was moved in spirit, to be here this day, in this Fair, this wicked and foul Fair; and fitter may it be called a Foul than a Fair; to protest against the abuses of it, the foul abuses of it, in regard of the afflicted saints, that are troubled, very troubled, exceedingly troubled, with the opening of the merchandise of Babylon again, and the peeping of popery under the stalls here, here, in the high places . . .[1]

Denouncing it as an "idolatrous grove of images," Busy overturns a basket of ginger-bread, for which he is put in stocks. To Waspe's question, "What are you, sir?", Busy replies: "One that rejoiceth in his affliction, and sitteth here to prophesy the destruction of fairs and May-games, wakes and Whitson-ales and doth sigh and groan for the reformation of these abuses."[2] He consoles Dame Purecraft by describing his misfortune as his "calling," his "extraordinary calling." With Busy in stocks, Dame Purecraft falls in love with Troubleall, a madman, after whom she exclaims, "O, that I might be his yoke-fellow, and be mad with him, what a many should we draw to madness in truth with us!" Later Quarlous, in Troubleall's clothes, is pursued by the widow who calls to him:

> "Good sir, vouchsafe a yoke-fellow in your madness, shun not one of the sanctified sisters, that would draw with you in truth.
> Quarlous (as the madman): "Away, you are a herd of hypocritical proud ignorants, rather wild than mad; fitter for woods, and the society of beasts, than houses, and the congregation of men. You are the second part of the society of canters, outlaws to order and discipline, and the only privileged church-robbers of Christendom. Let me alone. . . .
> Pure: "I must uncover myself unto him, or I shall never enjoy him, for all the cunning men's promises. (aside). Good sir, hear me, I am worth six thousand pound, my love to you is become my rack;

1. Ben Johnson, "Bartholomew Fair" (1614), Acting Text, especially edited for the production given by the Old Vic Theater Company of London in the Assembly Halls at the Edinburgh International Festival of Music and Drama, 1950. Printed by the Scots Review, Edinburgh, p. 47.
2. Ibid., p. 62.

I'll tell you all and the truth, since you hate the hyprocisy of the party-coloured brotherhood. These seven years I have been a wilful holy widow only to draw feasts and gifts from my entangled suitors; I am also a special maker of marriages for our decayed brethren with our rich widows, for a third part of their wealth, when they are married, for the relief of the poor elect: as also our poor handsome young virgins, with our wealthy bachelors or widowers; to make them steal from their husbands, when I have confirmed them in the faith, and got all put into their custodies. Our elder, Zeal-of-the-land, would have had me, but I know him to be the capital knave of the land, making himself rich, by being made a feoffee in trust to deceased brethren, and cozening their heirs, by swearing the absolute gift of their inheritance. And thus having eased my conscience and utter'd my heart with the tongue of my love; enjoy all my deceits together, I beseech you. I should not have reveal'd this to you, but that in time I think you are mad, and I hope you'll think me so too, sir?"[1]

When Busy gets free from the stocks, he resumes his denunciation; the puppet, Dionysius, takes up the argument

Busy: I will not fear to make my spirit and gifts known: assist me zeal, fill me, fill me, that is make me full! First, I say unto thee, idol, thou hast no calling.

Dion.: You lie, I am call'd Dionysius.

Leath.: The motion says, you lie, he is call'd Dionysius in the matter, and to that calling he answers.

Busy: I mean no vocation, idol, no present lawful calling.

Dion.: Is yours a lawful calling?

Leath.: The motion asketh, if yours be a lawful calling.

Busy: Yes, mine is of the spirit.

Dion.: Then idol is a lawful calling.

Leath.: He says, then idol is a lawful calling; for you call'd him idol, and your calling is of the spirit.

. . . . . .

Busy: . . . my main argument against you is, that you are an abomination: for the male, among you, putteth on the apparel of the female, and the female of the male.

Dion.: You lie, you lie, you lie abominably.

Cokes: Good, by my troth, he has given him the lie thrice.

Dion.: It is your old stale argument against the players, but it will not hold against the puppets; for we have neither male nor female amongst us. And that thou may'st see, if thou wilt, like a malicious purblind zeal as thou art. (Takes up his garment).

Edg.: By my faith, there he has answer'd you, friend, a plain demonstration.

Dion.: Nay, I'll prove, against e'er a Rabbin of them all, that my standing is as lawful as his; that I speak by inspiration, as

1. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 66-67.

> well as he; that I have as little to do with learning as he; and do scorn her helps as much as he.
> Busy: I am confuted, the cause hath failed me.[1]

To Adam Overdo, the justice of peace, who had been secretly marking down the sins of others and who finds his own wife intoxicated, Quarlous addresses what might be the main sentence of the play:

> . . . and remember you are but Adam flesh and blood! you have your frailty, forget your other name of Overdo, and invite us all to supper. There you and I will compare our discoveries; and drown the memory of all enormity in your biggest bowl at home.[2]

We have no record of what the king thought of the play, which had been written to please him, but it was not well received by the general public[3] whose sympathies, while not aligned with the Separatist "prophet," were more in accord with him than with their politico-ecclesiastical officials who persecuted him.

Throughout the reign of James I, there remained in England and Wales, "a pent-up Brownism" which had not been sufficiently drawn off by the slender emigration to Holland;[4] in London, a remnant of the church of Barrowe and Greenwood continued under the leadership of Nicholas Lee.[5] As we have noted, in 1612 there was established at Spitalfield a Baptist Church, which Burgess describes as

> '. . . a church led and officered by laymen. It had been tested by the trials of exile and the fires of controversy. . . . It was

1. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 75-77.
2. Ibid., pp. 79-80.
3. "Its satire on puritanism . . . roused hostility, and it appears to have been little performed during Charle I's reign. At the Restoration it was revived with enthusiasm. Pepys, who saw it 7 Sept. 1661, says it had not been acted for forty years." Dictionary of National Bibliography, xxx, pp. 187-188. It was revived in 1950, after two hundred years, and presented at the Edinburgh International Festival; although well produced and played, it was still unpopular.
4. David Masson, THE LIFE OF JOHN MILTON: Narrated in connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary HISTORY OF HIS TIMES. (6 vols., London: Macmillan and Co., 1859-1877), II, 580.
5. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 314.

> deprived almost at once of its chief leaders by imprisonment, but it still held together. These brave men and women were dignified by the greatness of the cause they had espoused.'[1]

In his "Mistery of Iniquity" (1612), their leader, Thomas Helwys appealed for complete religious freedom, an appeal which Jordan describes as "the finest and fullest defence" which religious toleration had ever received in England.[2] Limiting the power of the magistrate to the dealings of man with man, Helwys declares:

> 'Our lord the king is but an earthly king, and he hath no authority as a king but in earthly causes, and if the king's people be obedient and true subjects, obeying all human laws made by the king, our lord and king can require no more: for men's religion to God is betwixt God and themselves; the king shall not answer for it, neither may the king be judge between God and man. Let them be heretics, Turks, Jews or whatsoever, it appertains not to the earthly power to punish them in the least measure.'[3]

It is not to be wondered that such a courageous man should have been imprisoned almost at once; nevertheless, his church continued. From his writings we conclude that his followers believed and practiced that "Every separate congregation of people, whether it has officers or not, may come together to Pray, Prophecie, brake bread, and administer in all the holy ordinances."[4] Within a few years this Baptist pioneer was dead, for in 1616 his brother refers to his will; however, others came to carry forward the ideals for which he had died. In 1614, Leonard Busher wrote "Religious Peace or, A Plea for Liberty of Conscience,"[5]

1. Ut per Underwood, op. cit., p. 46.
2. Jordan, op. cit., vol. II, p. 274. Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 47.
3. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 254-255. Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 48.
4. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 253.
5. No copy of this edition is known to have survived; we have only copies of the 1646 edition which claims to be a reprint of this earlier printing. Vide "Tracts on Liberty of Conscience," Hanserd Knollys Society, London, 1846. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 278 for efforts to identify Busher.

in which he maintains that Christians should preach the gospel to every creature in all nations and that those who believed should be "'dipped for dead in the water.'"[1] Jordan says that Busher did not plead for the bare toleration of his own group but that he made "a thoughtful and noble demand for religious liberty for all men because they were men ordained by God to share in the general redemption through the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice."[2] John Murton, formerly a furrier of Gainsborough who had shared in the exile in Holland and who was known in 1615 as "'a Teacher of a Church of the Anabaptists at Newgate,'"[3] published, in 1615, "Obiections: Answered by way of Dialogue, wherein is proved . . . That no man ought to be persecuted for his religion . . . ."[4] Murton declares that "'none should be compelled to worship God but such as come willingly;'" the temporal sword should not be used to punish the transgressors of spiritual laws, for "'the lawgiver himself hath commanded that the transgressors of these laws should be let alone until the harvest.'"

> 'All come not at the first hour, some come not till the eleventh hour; if those that come not till the last hour should be destroyed because they came not at the first hour, then should they never come, but be prevented.'[5]

In 1620 the Baptists published "A Discription of What God hath Predestinated Concerning Man," in which they stated the General Baptist view that no man was damned by divine decree, but that all men might repent and believe the gospel; therefore, they held that it was wrong to destroy a man for

1. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 277-278.
2. Jordan, op. cit., vol. II, p. 298.
3. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 257-258.
4. Only two copies of this original edition remain (Bodleian Library); in 1662 it was reprinted under the title, "Persecution for Religion." Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 258.
5. Ut per Price, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 521-522.

his mistaken beliefs, because as long as he lived there was a hope that he might turn from his errors and be saved.[1] Also in this same work they described how a church should be organized upon the baptism of its members and not upon a covenant. They maintained that any private church member might preach, make converts and administer baptism. They claimed:

> '. . . there is not the least shew in all the Testament of Iesus Christ, that Baptising is peculiar onely to Pastors, which might satisfie any man of reason; neither can it bee proued that euer ordinary Pastor did Baptise. And it is most plaine, conuerting and Baptising is no part of the Pastors office: his office is, to feed, to watch, to oversee, the flocke, of Christ already the Church: his charge is to take heede to the flocke, and to feed the Church, and to defend them in the truth against all gainsayers: furthes [further] then which, no charge is laid vpon him by vertue of his office: That hee may Preach, conuert, and Baptise, I deny: not, as another disciple may; but not that either it is required, or he doth performe it by vertue of his office; no proofe for that imagination can be shewed: and therfore it remaineth firme & stable; euery Disciple that hath abilitie is authorized, yea commanded to Preach, conuert & Baptise, aswell and asmuch (if not more) then a Pastor.'[2]

Burrage says that Helwys, in The Mistery of Iniquity, "certainly exaggerates the number of separatists (he cannot mean Anabaptists) when he speaks of 'vs (that are thousands of the K. of great Brittans subiects.'"[3] However, by 1622 the king was troubled in hearing every day "'of soe manie defeccions from our Religion, both to Poperie and Anabaptisme or other points of separacion, in some parts of this kingdome.'"[4] In "A Discovery of the Errors of the English Anabaptists" (1623), Edmond Jessop describes them as

> 'this little silly sect of English Anabaptists . . . who (poore people) though he [Satan] haue much possessed their minds with

1. Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 49 and Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 260.
2. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 262.
3. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 254.
4. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 267.

> error, yet there is some hope that they will be reclaimed, because it appeareth plainly (with some of them) that they are caried thorough zeale, being meerly seduced by such as haue beene longest settled in the deceit.'[1]

In 1626, the Baptist Church at Spitalfield sent a letter to the Waterlander Church in Amsterdam, seeking to strengthen their relation; in this effort there were associated four other Baptist Churches in England--Lincoln, Coventry, Salisbury (Sarum) and Tiverton, of which Burrage says, the total number of members was "at least one hundred and fifty."[2] The two delegates who accompanied this letter insisted that unordained members of the church might "'preach, convert, baptize, and perform other public actions with the consent of the church, when bishops are not present;'" they also defended the rights of Christians to accept the office of magistrate and to bear arms.[3] However these negotiations proved futile, and when the Dutch-English Waterlander Church sent John Drew, in 1630, to the five churches in England, beseeching them not to be too hasty in disciplining members for attending the services of the established church, their reply was so harsh that correspondance was not renewed until 1696.

Upon his return to England, Henry Jacob had consulted and prayed with many "'famious Men for Godliness and Learning'" and had concluded that it was as warrantable to set up an independent church in England as it was in Holland or elsewhere; the Jersey Records inform that "'H. Jacob was willing to adventure himselfe for this Kingdom of Christs sake, ye rest encouraged him.'"[4] The Church was "gathered" in 1616,

1. Ut per Burrage, vol. I, pp. 266-267.
2. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 273.
3. Vide Underwood, op. cit., pp. 50-51. For translations of these letters vide Evans The Early English Baptists, vol. II, pp. 24-25, 30-32, 41-44.
4. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, p. 293.

after this manner:

> 'Hereupon y^e^ said Henry Jacob w^th^ Sabine, Staismore [Staresmore], Rich Browne, David Prior, Andrew Almey, W^m^. Throughton, Jno Allen, Mr Gibs, Edw^d^ Farre, Hen Goodall, & divers others well informed Saints haveing appointed a Day to Seek y^e^ Face of y^e^ Lord in fasting & Prayer, wherein that perticular of their Union togeather as a Church was mainly comended to y^e^ Lord: in y^e^ ending of y^e^ Day they ware United, Thus, Those who minded this present Union & so joyning togeather joyned both hands each w^th^ other Brother and stood in a Ringwise: their intent being declared, H. Jacob and each of the Rest made same confession or Profession of their Faith & Repentance, some ware longer some ware briefer, Then they Covenanted togeather to walk in all Gods Ways as he had revealed or should make known to them.
>
> 'Thus was the begining of that Church of which procced, they within a few Days gave notice to the brethen here of the Antient Church.
>
> 'After this Hen Jacob was Chosen & Ordained Pastor to that Church, & many Saints ware joyned to them.'[1]

Although at first there was a friendly relation between this church and the "Antient Church" of Barrowe and Greenwood, the older congregation was soon referring to the newer one as "Iakobs people" and as "Idolators" because they went to the parish assemblies.[2] Jacob served as pastor of the new church for eight years; in 1624 he was relieved of his office and went to "Virginia," where apparently he died. The Gould Manuscript informs us that

> 'after his Departure hence y^e^ Congregation remained a Year or two edifying one another in y^e^ best manner they could according to their Gifts received from above, And then at length Iohn Lathorp sometimes a Preacher in Kent, joyned to y^e^ Said Congregation; And was afterwards chosen and Ordained a Pastor to them, a Man of tender heart and a humble and meek Spirit serveing the Lord in the ministry about 9 years to their great Comfort.'[3]

The politico-ecclesiastical pattern which was beginning to emerge during the reign of Elizabeth continued to develop under James I;

1. Ut per Burrage, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 293-294.
2. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 314.
3. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 295-296.

the bishops became more and more dependent upon the Crown for support against popular dissatisfaction, whereas the Puritans turned more and more to Parliament to voice their demands for further reformation. Burnet says that under the Scottish king, the "Puritans gained credit, as he and the Bishops lost it."[1] The doctrine of divine right of sovereigns, which James had presented in his first Parliament (1610), had not been readily accepted, and Commons had opposed any curtailment of its liberty of debate.[2] In a judgment rendered against the king in 1613, Sir Edward Coke broke the Tudor tradition of bending the law to the royal desire and declared that the law was the boundry of royal prerogative;[3] and by opening with a Communion service which would exclude Romanists, the "addled" Parliament of 1614 showed its distrust of the king's servants, but upon dissolution, the rule of George Villiers, the king's new favorite, began. Old heroes died or were replaced; Sir Walter Raleigh was sacrificed to the Spaniards, and the naval strength which Elizabeth had massed, dwindled away. Men began to lose pride in their king and country; the buoyant spirit of the Elizabethan era was dying; the religious struggle became tense and bitter. John Selden's History of the Tithes (1617?), brought such a storm on all parsonage barns that Selden was at once summoned before the High Commissioners and forced to sign a humiliating submission.[4] Attributing the tardiness of the Reformation in Lancashire to the puritanical ministers who hindered the people from enjoying recreations on Sunday, the king issued

1. Bishop Burnet, History of His Own Times (2 vols., London: Printed for Thomas Ward, 1724), I, 17.
2. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 86.
3. Ibid., pp. 99-100.
4. Cf. Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, p. 264 and Price, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 530-531.

(1618) a declaration, known as the Book of Sports, that after the divine service the people were not to be discouraged from "lawful recreations;" however, when Archbishop Abbott opposed this declaration it was rescinded.[1] The need of money forced James to summon Parliament in 1621, but the prospects of a Spanish alliance, sealed by the proposed marriage of Prince Charles to the Infanta Maria, and the tragic loss of the Rhenish Palatinate to the Spaniards had intensified Commons' hostility toward the Crown, and they proceeded at once to impeach some of the king's ministers and to debate foreign affairs. When the king ordered them to the business he had laid before them, Commons entered in their Journal "A just and sober Protestation of their privilege to speak freely on all subjects," which made the king so angry that he sent for the book and tore out the page with his own hand. Upon the dissolution of Parliament, many of the pulpits took up the quarrel and denounced the Spaniards and their Jesuit servants. In 1622 the king forbade all preachers from meddling with matters of state and from referring to the affairs between princes and people; only bishops and deans were permitted to speak on subjects other than those comprehended in the Articles of Religion or the Book of Homilies which was to serve as "a pattern and a boundary;" afternoon sermons were restricted and all lecturers were required to have licenses from the bishops.[2] In February 1623, Prince Charles slipped out to Spain to "fetch" his bride; when he returned in October without her, the people rejoiced so greatly that Buckingham, undertaking the role of the Protestant defender,

1. Marsden, op. cit., p. 337.
2. "Directions Concerning Preachers," (1622), Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 516-518.

advised that Parliament be summoned, and both houses enthusiastically promised their assistance in the recovery of the Palatinate. However, the "English Solomon" had so neglected the army and navy that their improvising would prove of little benefit to that cause; his word meant so little that no sooner was Parliament dissolved (1624) but that he broke it by conceding liberty to all Roman Catholics in England as one of the terms of marriage between Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria of France.[1] His name became a jest in ale-houses, and "Great Britain" was judged to be "'less than little England was want to be, less in reputation, less in strength less in riches, less in all manner of virtue.'"[2] The French Ambassador wrote:

> 'Consider, for pity's sake, what must be the condition of a prince, whom the preachers publicly from the pulpit assail; whom the comedians of the metropolis bring up on the stage; whose wife attends these representations in order to enjoy the laugh against her husband; whom the parliament braves and despises; and who is universally hated by the whole people.'[3]

In her Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, Mrs. Hutchinson describes James' Court as "a nursery of lust and intemperance;" she says that "the honour, wealth, and glory of the nation, wherein Queen Elizabeth left it, were soon prodigally wasted by this thriftless heir," whose court set such a fashion that every great house in the country soon became "a sty of uncleanness."[4] Amid such "Prophane-ness and irreligion," many had a feeling of security which troubled such Puritan preachers as

1. Frere, op. cit., p. 380.
2. Ut per Trevelyan, Stuarts, pp. 106-107.
3. Ut per Price, op. cit., vol. I, p. 546.
4. Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson by his widow LUCY, ed. from the original manuscript by Julius Hutchinson, revised by C. H. Firth (2 vols., London: John C. Nimmo, 1885), I, 110-111.

Samuel Ward.[1] Mrs. Hutchinson tells that some of the ministers

> warned the people of the approaching judgments of God, which could not be expected but to follow such high provocations; God in his mercy sent his prophets into all corners of the land, to preach repentance, and cry out against the ingratitude of England, who thus requited so many rich mercies that no nation could ever boast of more; and by these a few were everywhere converted and established in faith and holiness; but at court they were hated, disgraced, and reviled, and in scorn had the name of Puritan fixed upon them.[2]

A vivid account of the religious conditions found in some of the local parishes at that time is given by Richard Baxter who was born in 1615 at Eaton-Constantive:

> We lived in a Country that had but little Preaching at all: In the Village where I was born there was four Readers successively in Six years time, ignorant Men, and two of them immoral in their lives; who were all my School-masters. In the Village where my Father lived, there was a Reader of about Eighty years of Age that never preached, and had two Churches about Twenty miles distant: His Eyesight failing him, he said Common-Prayer without Book; but for the Reading of the Psalms and Chapters, he got a Common Thresher and Day-Labourer one year, and a Taylor another year: (for the Clerk could not read well): And at last he had a Kinsman of his own, (the excellentest Stage-player in all the Country, and a good Gamester and good Fellow) that got Orders and supplied one of his Places! After him another younger Kinsman, that could write and read, got Orders: And at the same time another Neighbour's Son that had been a while at School turn'd Minister, and who would needs go further than the rest, ventur'd to preach (and after got a Living in Staffordshire,) and when he had been a Preacher about Twelve or Sixteen years, he was fain to give over, it being discovered that his Orders were forged by the first ingenious Stage-Player. After him another Neighbour's Son took Orders, when he had been a while an Attorney's Clerk, and a common Drunkard, and tipled himself into so great Poverty that he had no other way to live: it was feared that he and more of them came by their Orders the same way with the forementioned Person: These were the School-masters of my Youth (except two of them:) who read Common Prayer on Sundays and Holy-days, and taught School and tipled on the Weekdays, and whipt the Boys when they were drunk, so that we changed them very oft. Within a few miles about us, were near a dozen more Ministers that were near Eighty years old apiece, and never preached; poor ignorant Readers, and most of them of Scandalous Lives: only three or four constant competent

1. Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward, ed., M. M. Knappen (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1933), 122.
2. Hutchinson, Memoirs, vol. I, p. 112.

> Preachers lived near us, and those (though Conformable all save one) were the common Marks of the People's Obloquy and Reproach, and any that had but gone to hear them, when he had no Preaching at home, was made the Derision of the Vulgar Rabble, under the odious Name of a Puritane.[1]

In such circumstances Baxter's father was changed "by the bare reading of the Scriptures in private, without either Preaching, or Godly Company, or any other Books but the Bible;" yet his scripture reading was not without interruptions and disturbances, for as soon as the common prayers were briefly read dancing began under a May-pole near his door and continued throughout the Sabboth. Baxter writes:

> Many times my Mind was inclined to be among them, and sometimes I broke loose from Conscience, and joyned with them; and the more I did it the more I was enclined to it. But when I heard them call my Father Puritan, it did much to cure me and alienate me from them: for I consider'd that my Father's Exercise of Reading the Scripture, was better than theirs, and would surely be better thought on by all men at the last; and I considered what it was for that he and others were thus derided.[2]

Mrs. Hutchinson tells us that all moral earnestness came to be branded under the term Puritan:

> . . . if any, out of mere morality and civil honesty, discountenanced the abominations of those days, he was a Puritan, however he conformed to their superstitious worship; if any showed favour to any godly honest person, kept them company, relieved them in want, or protected them against violent or unjust oppression, he was a Puritan; if any gentleman in his country maintained the good laws of the land, or stood up for any public interest, for good order or government, he was a Puritan: in short, all that crossed the views of the needy courtiers, the proud encroaching priests, the thievish projectors, the lewd nobility and gentry--whoever was zealous for God's glory or worship, could not endure blasphemous oaths, ribald conversation, profane scoffs, Sabbath-breaking, derision of the word of God, and the like--whoever could endure a sermon, modest habit or conversation or anything good,--all these

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae: or Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times Faithfully Published from his own original Manuscript, by Matthew Sylvester . . . (5 lines), (London: Printed for T. Parkhurst, etc., 1696), 1-2.

2. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

> were Puritans; and if Puritans, then enemies to the king and his government, seditious, factious hypocrites, ambitious disturbers of the public peace, and finally, the pest of the kingdom.[1]

The Puritans were not, however, without their "cheats"; Mrs. Hutchinson tells of those who came in sheep's clothing to destroy more than to edify. Those who had offended the court or who failed to secure preferment there turned to the Puritans for advancement; some assumed a form of godliness, in hopes of securing favor among the devout people; others, without any serious religious consideration found a strong ally in the Puritans in opposing the arbitrary ways of the king.[2] There were men who made profit of the king's unpopularity by giving out dark predictions. Bishop Burnet refers to two such men, Davison and Bruce, who were considered to be prophets by many; "Some of the things that they foretold came to pass, but my father, who knew them both, told me of many of their predictions that he himself heard them throw out, which had no effect: But all these were forgot."[3] However, there were some things quite obvious to any alert mind; Bishop Hall wrote in 1622, "'there needs no prophetical spirit to discern by a small cloud that there is a storm coming towards our church, such an one which shall not only drench our plumes, but shake our peace.'"[4] The storm, however, did not break upon James; he died, March 27, 1625, and was praised by Bishop Laud as the "'greatest patron of the church, and the most learned prince that had ever been known for ages;'"[5] the storm broke upon his son.

1. Hutchinson, Memoirs, vol. I, pp. 114-115.
2. Ibid., pp. 116-117.
3. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, pp. 17-18.
4. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., pp. 123-124.
5. Ut per Price, op. cit., vol. I, p. 542. Cf. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, p. 30.

CHAPTER FIVE

LAY-PREACHING IN THE PURITAN REVOLT (1625-1646)

I. THE DETERIORATION OF THE POLITICAL SITUATION
   A. Charles I and Parliament
   B. The "Laudian Decade"
   C. Nonconformity
   D. The defiance of arbitrary government
   E. Beginning of the war

II. PLEAS FOR FREEDOM
   A. John Milton
   B. John Spencer
   C. Lord Brooke

III. THE "TUB PREACHER" PAMPHLETS (TAYLOR'S & OTHERS')
   A. "A Swarme of Sectaries"
   B. "The Brownists Synagogue"
   C. "New Preachers"
   D. "The Brownists Conventicles"
   E. "The Brothers of the Separation"
   F. "The Discovery of a Swarme of Separatists"
   G. "A True Narrative"
   H. "Lucifers Lacky"
   I. "A Tale in a Tub"
   J. "A Full and Compleat Answer"
   K. "The Whole Life . . . of Henry Walker"
   L. "A Cluster of Coxcombes"
   M. "An Apology for Private Preaching"

IV. THE FIRST CIVIL WAR
   A. The nature of the struggle
   B. Cromwell's "men of spirit"
   C. The Westminster Assembly
   D. Cromwell and toleration

V. THE GROWTH OF LAY-PREACHING IN THE ARMY
   A. Conflict within army
   B. The New Model Army
   C. The consequences of Naseby
   D. Baxter's report
   E. The conclusion of the war

Charles I was crowned on February 2, 1626, a day remembered by Richard Baxter as the day of an earthquake which "put all the people into a fear, and somewhat possessed them with awful thoughts of the Dreadful God."[1] Prominent in the coronation service was William Laud, who had already surpassed the Archbishop of Canterbury in gaining the young king's favor. Laud headed a party characterized by its "Arminianism," its Catholic revival, its support of the royal prerogative and its opposition to nonconformity; he shared Charles' judgment of the Puritans as

> 'a very dangerous and seditious people, who would, under pretence of conscience, which kept them from submitting to the spiritual jurisdiction, take the first opportunity they could find, or make, to withdraw themselves from his temporal jurisdiction, . . .'[2]

These people were to be watched by Laud, as was another group which gathered close around Charles' throne. With a Roman Catholic queen at the head of court, it became increasingly fashionable to experience a re-conversion to papacy; Buckingham's mother and wife had already become Romanists and at times it seemed that the Duke himself would follow their example. These rumors added nothing to the Duke's popularity which was suffering from his ill-fated expeditions in the European war; Parliament had lost all confidence in him, but when his name was introduced in their debate, the king dissolved both houses (August 1625). However, after another tragic expedition, Charles was forced to summon his second Parliament, which, despite the Duke's efforts to win popularity by repealing the toleration of the Romanists, proceeded at once to initiate his impeachment, which Charles prohibited only by dissolving both houses.

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, p. 5.
2. Clarenden, ut per William Holden Hutton, The English Church, from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne, (1625-1714) (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1903), 8.

Louis XIII was offended by the violation of the marriage-treaty, and in 1627 England found herself at war against France. To supply the Duke's ill-conceived and ill-planned expeditions, Charles at first asked for Free Gifts from his subjects, but when that failed he tried to extract the money by a Force loan, which the people resented as it was done without consent of Parliament. Many of Laud's party defended the king's position; Dr. Robert Sibthorpe, preached:

> '. . . if princes command anything which subjects may not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without either resistance or railing and reviling; and so to yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one.'[1]

Likewise Dr. Roger Manwaring declared that kings have the right to demand money from their subjects and that if a subject refused it would be difficult for that subject "'to defend his conscience from the heavy prejudice of resisting the ordinance of God, and receiving to himself damnation.'"[2] Nevertheless, the people still resisted the king's extractions, and in March 1628 Charles had to call his third Parliament which proceeded at once to enact a Petition of Right which proclaimed the rights of persons and property against arbitrary taxation, arbitrary imprisonment and the forced billeting of troops in the peoples' homes.[3] The desperate need of money forced Charles to accept this Petition, but he was annoyed when Parliament proceeded to discuss church-matters and when Commons began to enumerate the Duke's failures and to ask for his removal, Parliament was dissolved. However, on his way to Portsmouth to lead another expedition, the Duke was assassinated; while the king

1. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., p. 27.
2. Ibid., p. 28.
3. Trevelyan, Stuarts, pp. 117-119.

grieved for his dearest friend, the rest of England rejoiced, singing ballads in honor of the assassin and drinking his health.[1] When the fleet returned in the same defeat and despair, the king and people were ready to seek peace, but there was to be no peace between king and parliament. In January 1629, Tonnage and Poundage was granted the king for one year only and resolutions were passed condemning all who advised or assisted the collection of taxes or subsidies, other than those granted by Parliament, as betrayers of the liberty of England; with the king's officers beating on the doors, another resolution was passed which condemned as a "capital enemy to this kingdom and the commonwealth" any who brought in innovations in religion or who sought to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism.[2] Thus the questions of taxation and predestination were linked together, and the alliance of Parliament and Puritanism was sealed.

Clark describes the years between the parliaments (1630-1640) as "the Laudian decade," for during this period Laud was "the King's trusted and confidential adviser," not only in ecclesiastical matters but in general policy as well; Clark says he was "the true keeper of the King's conscience . . . the real power behind the throne."[3] Henrietta Maria might have questioned such a statement, because since the death of Buckingham, the king had fallen in love with his French queen and followed her advice. When he tried to revive (1637) the Penal Laws, Laud found that the queen stood in his way; for the twenty-two persons he claimed to have recalled from Rome, the queen doubtlessly could have claimed

1. Trevelyan, Stuarts, pp. 120-121.
2. Ibid., p. 128.
3. Clark, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 270-272.

twice as many for Rome; he wrote against the papal claim, but the Pope tempted him with a cardinal's hat.[1] If Laud's influence over the king was somewhat conditioned by that of the queen, it was strengthened by the winning of Thomas Wentworth whose friendship and alliance in a policy of "thoroughness"[2] greatly strengthened Laud in his efforts to enforce the observance of the canonical ceremonies and to work for the restoration of those "ancient approved ceremonies" which had been abandoned in the Reformation.[3] When charged at his trial for introducing popish and superstitious ceremonies into the worship of the Church of England, Laud was to reply:

> 'all that I laboured for in this particular was that the external worship of God in the Church might be kept up in uniformity and decency, and in some beauty of holiness.'[4]

Nor were Laud's efforts without lasting benefit; as Bishop of London he prohibited the secular use of the Cathedral and "originated a new view as to the use of sacred buildings, which was imposed in his own day by order and coercion alone, but which won its way into popular custom after his death."[5] Many of the churches "lay nastily," with the altar often used as a table for hats or coats or other such purposes; it was reported that the chancel of the church of Knottingley was used in 1634 for cock-fighting and that dogs wandered about in the churches so that at Tadlow on Christmas Day 1630 one of them seized the Communion loaf and ran out with it.[6] Such instances gave Laud the excuse of restoring

1. Vide Hutton, op. cit., p. 47. Also Fuller, op. cit., vol. III, p. 380.
2. Vide Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., pp. 395-396.
3. Masson, Milton, vol. I, pp. 345-346.
4. Ut per Masson, Milton, vol. I, p. 344.
5. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 145.
6. Hutton, op. cit., pp. 49, 57. Vide Eleanor Trotter, Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish, with special reference to Local Government, (Cambridge: University Press, 1919), 46.

the altar to the east end of the church and of fencing it with a rail. The Puritans who protested against these "innovations" were suppressed as the originators of most of the ills of church and state; Laud described them as "'the root of all rebellion and disobedient intractableness, and all schism and sauciness in the country, nay, in the Church itself.'"[1] In his England there was to be no place for such disturbers of the peace; Laud sought to control the press and pulpit so that no puritan voice could be heard, and, as Trevelyan says,

> He was able almost single-handed to accomplish his work of universal repression, because of the prestige he enjoyed and the fear he inspired as the King's confident; and because the parish system and the Church Courts gave the Primate much more authority to interfere in local religion than the King possessed in local government. But no other one of the High Churchmen of that day would have been at the pains to use those powers with such unwonted stringency.[2]

In 1629, against Abbot's wish, Laud, as Bishop of London, caused the king to issue injunctions which required the lecturers to wear the surplice and to read the service before they preached and to take "a living with cure of souls" as soon as such was offered to them.[3] In 1633, the year when he became the Archbishop of Canterbury, Laud persuaded Charles to republish the Book of Sports, which declared that "no lawful recreation shall be barred to our good people, which shall not tend to the breach of our . . . laws and canons of our Church;" also all "Puritans and Precisians" were either to be constrained to conform themselves or to leave the country.[4] Many ministers hesitated to read

1. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., p. 34.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 139.
3. Masson, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 340-341.
4. The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner (3rd ed. revised, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), 101.

this declaration from their pulpits, but those who hesitated too long were removed from their places or brought before the Court of High Commission, where, with writers, printers, lecturers and the poor of the conventicles, they were required to take an oath by which they would be forced to witness against themselves or were imprisoned without any further ado. The fear of this court strengthened Laud's hand, as did his Metropolitical Visitation which enabled him to investigate every parish and to supervise every clergyman in the whole province of Canterbury. In the first (Jan. 2, 1633/4) of his annual accounts of these visitations which he conscientiously made to his majesty, Laud reports:

> Since my returne out of Scotland M^e^ John Davenport . . . hath now resigned his vicarage [of St. Stevens in Colmanstreet], declared his judgmt against conformity w^th^ ye church of Engld; and is since gone (as I heare) to Amsterdam.
>
> As for Bath and Wells I fynde y^t^ the L^d^ B^p^ hath in his late Visitacõn taken a great deale of paines to see all ye Ma^thy^ Instruccõns observed. And particularly hath put downe Diverse Lecturers in Market Townes, which were Beneficed men in other Gishoppes Diocisses, Because he found y^t^ when they had preached factious & Disorderly Sermons, they retyred into other Countyes, where his Jurisdicõn would not reach to punish them.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Con: & Lich. ---
>
> His L^d^ farther certifyes y^t^ he hath suppressed a seditious Lecture at Repon and Diverse monthly Lectures, with [H?]ast and a Moderato^e^ (like that which they called prophecying in Qn. Elizabeth's tyme) as alsoe ye Running Lecture soe called, because ye Lecturer went from Village to Village, and at ye end of ye weeke proclaimed where they should have him next, y^t^ his Disciples might followe. They say this Lect^e^ was ordeyned to illuminate ye darke corners of y^t^ Diocess.
>
> [Marginal notation, evidently by Charles I: If ther bee darke corners in this Dioces it were fitt a even Light should illuminat it & not this that is falce & uncertaine.] [1]

In his controversy with the Romanist Fisher, Laud declared, "'I will never take it upon me to express that tenet or opinion, the denial of the foundation only excepted, which may shut any Christian,

1. Lambeth Library, Manuscript 943.247 (1633).

even the meanest, out of heaven;'"[1] yet he took it upon himself to set up such a standard of uniformity that thousands of conscientious people were shut out of England.[2] While there were some learned and wealthy among these religious refugees, the majority were the poor, who had had little chance of education; yet they understood the inner depths of faith and had a courage which defied tyrants. The moderate Puritans either left the country or assumed enough of conformity to escape Laud's alert search; very few of the "respectable" ones dared to meet in woods or barns to preach or pray according to the dictates of their conscience--that glory belonged to others. Trevelyan says:

> The trials for active dissent under Laud are the records of the poor, seized at their worship and confronted with the might of Church and State in the High Commission. Their love of English liberty and their steadfast adherence to the light within them, more than atone for the want of that learning which had never been within their reach. Men and women such as these—more than Bastwick, Burton and Prynne, more than Hampden himself—are worthy to stand with Eliot as pure confessors of liberty and religion.[3]

In a letter (June 11, 1631), Bishop Hall, reminds Laud of the information already given him of "a busy and ignorant schismatick lurking in London" and tells him that now

> 'I hear, to my grief, that there are eleven several congregations . . . of separatists about the city, furnished with their idly-pretended pastors, who meet together in brew-houses and such other meet places of resort, every Sunday.'[4]

One of these separatist congregations was the Independent Church which Henry Jacob had founded; on April 2, 1632, their service was interrupted and about forty-two were imprisoned, including their pastor, John

1. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., pp. 42-43.
2. Trevelyan says: ". . . 20,000 Englishmen fled from Laud's persecution between 1628 and 1640." (Stuarts, p. 144).
3. Trevelyan, Stuarts, pp. 142-143.
4. Ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. I, p. 632 (footnote).

Lathorp, Mr. Barbone, Marke Lucar, Sam Hon [How?], Mr. Crafton [Grafton] and H. Dod.[1] In May of 1632, the "Antient Church" was seized upon, but only two of them were imprisoned. In the Gould Manuscript we have this account of their imprisonment:

> 'The Lord thus tryed & experienced them & their Friends & foes y^e^ Space of some two Years, some only under Baill, some in Hold: in w^ch^ time y^e^ Lord Wonderfully magnified his Name & refreshed their Spirits abundantly, for
> 1. In that time y^e^ Lord opened their mouths so to speak at y^e^ High Comission & Pauls & in private even y^e^ weake Women as their Subtill & malicious Adversarys ware not able to resist but ware asshamed.
> 2. In this Space y^e^ Lord gave them So great faviour in y^e^ Eyes of their Keepers y^t^ they suffered any friends to come to them and they edifyed & comforted one another on y^e^ Lords Days breading bread &c.
> . . . . . .
> 5. In this very time of their restraint y^e^ Word was so farr from bound, & y^e^ Saints so farr from being scared from the Ways of God that even then many ware in Prison added to y^e^ Church, . . .
> 6. Not one of those that ware taken did recant or turne back from the truth, through fear or through flatterry or cunning Slights but all ware y^e^ more strengthened [sic] thereby.'[2]

On May 8, 1632, these prisoners were brought to the Court of High Commission where they were reminded of the law that those who are taken at conventicles and remain obstinate shall be made to abjure the kingdom and upon their return would be tried for felony. William Pickering replied: "'I trust I have nothing against the law.'" Henry Dod, whom Laud called "'the obstinate and perverse leader of these folks,'" declared: "'We stand for the truth,'" and refused to take the oath. When Laud demanded of Lathorp, "'Where are your orders?'", Lathorp said:

> 'I am a minister of the Gospel of Christ, and the Lord hath qualified me.'
> Laud: 'Is that a sufficient answer? you must give a better answer before you and I part.'

1. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, p. 296.
2. Ibid., pp. 296-297.

Lathorp: 'I do not know that I have done anything which might cause me justly to be brought before the judgment-seat of man. And for this oath I do not know the nature of it.'
King's Advocate: 'The manner of the oath is—that you shall answer to that you are accused of—for schism.'
York and London: 'If he will not take his oath, away with him.'
Lathorp: 'I dare not take this oath.'[1]

In a letter dated June 13, 1632, Laud says: "'We took another conventicle of Separatists in Newington Woods upon Sunday last in the very brake where the King's stags should have been lodged for his hunting the next morning.'"[2] Some of the prison keepers were not unsympathetic toward these poor conscientious people; Francis Tucker, a bachlor of divinity who was imprisoned in Newgate for debts, squealed that a fellow prisoner, Samuel Eaton, "a schismatical and dangerous fellow," was permitted by the keeper to preach to seventy persons openly and publicly against the bishops and that the keeper had permitted him to go abroad and to preach to conventicles.[3] In his report of 1634/5 to Charles, Laud reveals that "little schools and colonies" of separatists were scattered throughout England; he had discovered a nest at Ashford and describes Bedfordshire as "the most tainted of any part of ye Diocesse;" in Lincoln there were many Anabaptists, led by one Johnson, a baker, and many at Kensworth in Harfordshire, and some other places were leaving their churches "by troupes" to follow after other ministers. He reports that in Norwich "one Simon Jacob, alias—Bradshaw, and Ralph Smith, two wanderers, went up and downe preaching here and there, wthout Place of Aboad or Authority" and that when the bishop summoned them, they ran out of that diocese.[4] On April 1, 1634, the High Commission Court came to the

1. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 276.
2. Ibid., pp. 277-278.
3. Vide Waddington, op. cit., pp. 279-280.
4. Lambeth Library, MS. 943-246.

archbishop's aid by issuing a proclamation to all the mayors, justices-of-peace and others of the king's officers:

> 'Taking with you a constable, and such other convenient assistance as you think meet, we require you to enter into any house or place where you shall have intelligence or probably suspect that any such private conventicles, meetings, or exercise of religion are held, kept, and frequented; and herein, and in every several room thereof you make diligent search for unlicensed books, and seize them in any place, exempt or not exempt.'[1]

The migration continued; Mr. Lathorp was released from prison (June 1, 1634) and was permitted to sail to New England. However, Laud soon became jealous of so many escaping his authority and attempted to restrict their emigration; he also sought to bring the exiles in Holland under his jurisdiction and the foreign congregations in England into more conformity with the Church of England, which to many of the Puritans was being made ready for a re-marriage with Rome. In reporting to Charles in 1635, Laud writes:

> The Cathedrall Church beginnes to be in very good order. And I have allmost finished theyr Statutes, wch being once perfitted will . . . be a sufficyent Direccon for ye making of ye Statutes for ye other Cathedralls of ye New Erecc̄on, wch in King Henry ye 8^{ths} tyme had eyther none left, or none confirmed, and those wch are, in many thinges not canonicall.[2]

Laud, however, faithfully records the increasing opposition which such plans were meeting; there was the old trouble with the lecturers, and the whole diocese of Norwich was "much out of order;" in Landaffe the Bishop had found "two noted Schismatickes, Wroth and Erbury, that ledd awaye many simple People after them" and had preferred articles against them in the High Commission Court.[3] However, next year (1636) Laud

1. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 280.
2. Lambeth Library, MS. 943.247.
3. Ibid.

had to confess that such measures had not suppressed these people:

> I have every yeare acquainted your Ma^ty and soe must doe now, that there are still about Ashford and Egebton diverse Brownists and other Separatists. But they are soe very meane and poore people, that we knowe not what to doe with them. They are said to be ye Disciples of one Turner of F[?]ennar who was long since apprehended, and imprisoned by order of ye Ma^th high Comission Court. . . .[1]

Laud records that numerous pamphlets against the bishops were beginning to appear in London and that lecturers abounded in Suffolk, without any regard to the bishops or canons; at Ipswich the people resolved to have as their minister either one Mr. Warde who "now standes censured in ye High Comission" or none, and in Norwich "one M^r Bridge rather then he would conforme, hath left his Lecture, and two cures, and is gone into Holland . . . ," of whom the king wrote on the margin, "Lett him goe wee are well ridd of him."[2] In 1637, Laud informed his majesty that the Separatists at Ashford in Kent continued to hold their meetings "notwithstanding ye excommunication of so many of them as have been discovered;" two of the "principall ringleaders" were still in prison, although a third, Bremer, a printer, had escaped.[3]

The remnant of the Jacob-Lathorp church also continued its meetings, and in the summer of 1637 elected for its pastor Henry Jessey, under whose leadership the church grew so that its members could not meet in any one place "'without being discovered by the Nimrods of the the Earth.'"[4] In 1638 six members, "'convinced that Baptism was not for Infants, but professed Beleivers,'" withdrew and joined with Mr.

1. Lambeth Library, MS. 943.248.
2. Ibid.
3. Lambeth Library, MS. 943.275.
4. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 325.

John Spilsbury, whose church was "'of the judgment with Sam Eaton.'"[1] Samuel Eaton, a button-maker, had been a member of an earlier secession (1633) which had received "a further Baptism" and had proceeded to organize a church; it was of this man that Francis Tucker had complained to Laud for holding conventicles in prison.[2] John Spilsbury (1593-c.1668), a cobbler in Aldersgate, had published some books "'wherein it is proved that Christ hath not presented to his Father's justice a satisfaction for the sins of all men; but only for the sins of them that do or shall believe in him, which are his elect only;'"[3] J. H. Shakespeare, the Baptist historian says:

> 'In 1638 there were either the first Calvinistic Baptist Church, with John Spilsbury as its pastor, containing Samuel Eaton, Mark Lucar, and others, or . . . in the same year there were two Calvinistic Baptist Churches in London, the one under John Spilsbury and the other under Samuel Eaton.'[4]

At first there was some bitterness toward the seceders, but on June 8, 1638, the friendship and fellowship between them and the mother-church was renewed and was to extend to the day of John Bunyan when we find pedobaptists and anti-pedobaptists worshiping together in the independent churches. In May of 1640 another group, under the leadership of Mr. Barbone, withdrew to form another Baptist church; later (1645?) Jessey himself became convinced of the Scriptural support for believers baptism.[5] In 1640 the question of the mode of baptism was raised by Richard Blunt who became convinced that baptism by sprinkling was unscriptural and that the true baptism "'ought to be by diping y^{e} Body

1. Kiffin Manuscript, ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, p. 302. Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 58.
2. Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 328-329. This Samuel Eaton died in prison in 1639 and is not to be confused with another preacher of the same name who was still living in 1641.
3. Ut per Underwood, op. cit., p. 60.
4. Ibid., p. 58.
5. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, p. 330.

into y^e Water, resembling Burial & riseing again.'"[1] Blunt was sent to Holland either to observe the practice of dipping or to receive such a baptism;[2] upon his return, he

> '. . . Baptized M^r Blacklock y^t was a Teacher amongst them, & M^r Blunt being Baptized, he & M^r Blacklock Baptized y^e rest of their friends that ware so minded, & many being added to them they increased much.'[3]

Despite the popular ridicule of "ducking over head and ears," baptism by immersion was accepted by both the General and Particular Baptists; and although many scoffed at their "dipping" the Baptist churches multiplied. Mr. Green and Captain Spencer began a congregation in Crutched Fryers about 1639, and we are informed that by 1644 there were seven such churches in London alone;[4] Masson says that in the same year there were forty-seven Particular Baptist churches in the rest of England, which differed from the other congregational churches only in the rejection of infant baptism and in the practice of immersion.[5] Nevertheless, all kinds of impieties were attributed to them; both Anglicans and conservative Puritans ridiculed their leaders as tradesmen turned tub-preachers. However, the Baptists were not alone in having such leaders, for at this time independent groups and preachers were appearing everywhere. Laud's program had encouraged radical opposition; Francis Cheynells wrote in 1648 that whereas many of moderate temper had preferred to remain within the Church, when Laud began setting up crucifixes

1. Kiffin Manuscript, ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, p. 302.
2. Cf. Underwood, op. cit., p. 59 and Burrage, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 334-335. Spilsbury maintained the position of Thomas Helwys that there was no need of a succession in baptism: 'After a general corruption of baptism, an unbaptized person might warrantably baptize, and so begin a reformation.' Vide Crosby, op. cit., vol. I, p. 103.
3. Ut per Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, p. 303.
4. Vide Burrage, op. cit., vol. II, p. 304.
5. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 146-148.

and requiring such popish customs as the bowing toward the communion-table "'the poor people cried out that England was turned Babylon, and began to separate.'"[1] John Canne chided those Puritans who remained in the Church with "'swarms of Atheists, Papists, adulterers, liars'" and urged them to join with those who "'do walk in the holy order of his gospel.'"[2] Disturbed by these critical events, many tradesmen who had drunk deep and long of the Scriptures, felt moved to use whatever gifts they had to cry judgment upon the evils of their times and to proclaim the Gospel of Christ to their generation. Many of the religious leaders were terrified at such prospects; in a pamphlet written against two "'infamous upstart Prophets, Richard Farnham, Weaver of Whitechapell, and John Bull, Weaver of St. Butolphs Algate,'" Thomas Heywood warns that if the liberty of button-makers, cobblers and weavers be not curbed, all would "'grow into confusion and disorder.'"[3] Haller traces "the agitation of boxmakers, button makers, cobblers and weavers" to the influence of the spiritual brotherhood of early Puritans, from which "the left wing" of separatists and enthusiasts broke and appealed to the populace. Haller says:

> We have seen that Brownism was the work of a disciple of Richard Greenham at Cambridge. John Robinson, leader of the Leyden, later the Plymouth, congregation, and his friend John Smyth, father of the English baptists, were also Cambridge men. Harrisson, Barrow, Greenwood, Johnson, Jacobs, Bradshaw, Ainsworth, Everard, Randall, Eaton John Goodwin, Saltmarsh, and Knollys may be named as typical of the many Puritan academic intellectuals who in some marked degree went over to the popular, the independent or separatist, generally the enthusiastic, side, where presently they inspired a host of button makers and the like also to take up the preaching of the word.
>
> . . . the decade of 1630 . . . was the time when the Puritanism of conventicle and tub, in a word populistic Puritanism, began to

1. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 341.
2. Ibid., pp. 333-334.
3. Ut per Haller, op. cit., p. 261.

> flourish and, under continuing pressure first from the prelates and then from the more moderate Puritans, rapidly became the decisive element in the whole revolutionary movement.[1]

In 1637, "the first of the revolutionary epoc,"[2] Henry Burton preached a sermon in which he condemned the bishops for changing the doctrine, worship, customs and government of the Church of England; he asked:

> 'Shall we see religion overturned; the laws outlawed; our liberties captured; Christ's kingdom and the king's throne undermined, and Antichrist's throne exalted over us; and that by a faction of Jesuited poly-pragmatice; and we, like heartless doves, set trembling while the Hagards outdare us, as if we were made for nothing but for them to prey upon?'[3]

For this sermon Burton was sent to the pillory, where, with Prynne and Bastwick, he spoke of his faith in Christ and in England, while crowds of sympathizers gathered around them and wept. Six months later "Free-born John" Lilburne was whipped through the streets of London for refusing to take the oath before the Star Chamber, and John Hampden, who had refused to pay Ship-money as a violation of the Petition of Right, was informed by a royalist judge that no Acts of Parliament made any difference with the king's right to command the persons and goods of his subjects.[4] When some ministers in Scotland attempted to use the Anglican Prayer-Book according to Charles' instructions, riots broke out in the churches; and in the winter of 1637-1638, Scotland signed the Covenant in defense of her faith and freedom.[5] Failing to

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 262.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 149.
3. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 338.
4. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 152.
5. Vide W. W. Hetherington, History of the Church of Scotland (4th ed., Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1844), 85-91.

bring Scotland back into submission through negotiations, Charles summoned Parliament in hope of gaining the money necessary to equip an army against the rebelling Scots. However, when Parliament assembled (April 13, 1640), greater discontent was shown against the king's ministers than against the Scots, and on May 5, 1640, the king dissolved it.[1] However, the Convocation, continuing its sitting, granted the king six subsidies and, unmindful of the rising resentment, proceeded to codify Laud's program into canons, the first of which declared that the "'most high and sacred order of things is of divine right'" and stated that to bear arms against kings, "'either offensively or defensively, on any pretence whatsoever'" is to resist the powers ordained of God.[2] While declaring itself against the growth of Popery, the Convocation also stated that "'there are other sects which endeavour the subversion both of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England no less than the Papists do'" and stated "'the proceedings and penalties'" against "'Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists and the like.'"[3] The sixth canon required all clergymen, schoolmasters, divinity graduates and those who "'practise physic'" to take the following oath:

> 'I A B, do swear that I approve the doctrine and discipline, of government, established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation; and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any Popish doctrine contrary to that which is so established; nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, etc., as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to stand, nor yet ever to subject it to the usurpations and superstitions of the See of Rome. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reservation

1. Vide Hutchinson, Memoirs, vol. I, p. 128.
2. Vide Hutton, op. cit., p. 82.
3. Hutton, op. cit., p. 82.

whatsoever. And this I do heartily, willingly, and truly upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God in Christ Jesus.'[1]

In a few days the whole country had heard of the Et Cetera Oath; while likely the et cetera had been inserted for the names of the other church officials, it was popularly taken for a trap of all kinds of unknown things—thus it was thought men were asked to swear to uphold what they knew not.[2] The alarm spread quickly; people started singing ballads about it, and pamphlets poured from secret presses; crowds swarmed around Lambeth Palace, and the last sessions of the synod had to have an armed guard; two thousand "sectaries" broke into a meeting of the High Commission Court at St. Paul's.[3] While London was in such a state of excitement, news came that the Scots had crossed the Tweed (August 20), and Charles was forced to summon Parliament to secure the indemnity which they demanded.

The Long Parliament began its sitting in November of 1640; enough money was appropriated to the Scottish army to keep it in England until other matters were settled. Hyde and Falkland joined with Pym and Hampden in impeaching Strafford; Laud soon followed Strafford to the Tower. The whole Prerogative system, with its Star Chamber and High Commission Court, was abolished. The people did not lag behind Parliament in expressing their hostility towards the ministers of arbitrary government. Parliament was besieged with petitions and complaints against the bishops, the most famous of which, "the Root-and-Branch Petition," carried fifteen thousand signatures; no longer were men content with

1. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., pp. 82-83.
2. Vide Clark, op. cit., vol. I, p. 294.
3. Vide Hutton, op. cit., pp. 84-85, Barclay, op. cit., pp. 130-131, Clark, op. cit., pp. 294-295.

patching up the old but now they demanded the abolition of the entire ecclesiastical system which had oppressed them. However, in the debate over the Root-and-Branch Petition, there was general agreement that the old system was to be abolished, but the difficulty came in agreeing on some other order to take its place; Cromwell expressed the state of many when he replied to the question of what he would substitute for the old: "'I can tell you, sirs, what I would not have; though I cannot, what I would.'"[1] Pym and other Parliamentary leaders favored a Puritan State Church, controlled by Parliamentary Lay-Commissions and granting toleration to neither Anglican nor Anabaptist. The Presbyterian scheme, which was supported by the Scottish people and most of the moderate Puritan ministers, would have the Church patterned after the Genevan ideal, with its orthodoxy enforced. A third plan, which Trevelyan describes as the "most characteristic of England herself and of future history,"[2] was proposed by a small group of independent Puritans who favored the liberty of worship. However, an unlimited toleration was considered by most members of Parliament as an evil to be avoided; nearly everyone favored an established church, but there was no agreement on its nature. While members of Parliament were thus uncertain and confused about a religious settlement, one determined woman was quite settled in what she believed and wanted; Henrietta Maria was busy pursuing her independent policy of raising money from the English Romanists, appealing to the Pope for military aid, seeking assistance from France and encouraging an Irish army. When it was reported in London (May 5th) that she was involved in a plot to force the release of Strafford and the dissolution of

1. Ut per Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 169.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, pp. 169-170.

Parliament, a Bill of Attainder was passed against Strafford and both Houses took an oath to defend the privileges of Parliament and the Protestant religion; a mob surrounded the king's palace, and Charles, after two days of such a siege, consented to Strafford's execution. For several months after this the king yielded to every demand of Parliament and at the same time listened to the violent plans of his wife. Trevelyan says:

> In the morning he could plot with Catholic agents and army officers; in the evening he could sign, with a glow of virtuous constitutional pride, laws destructive of monarchical power in England. . . . Charles's double-dealing, the despair alike of his friends and foes, was that of a stupid and selfish, not of a clever and treacherous man.[1]

He had already lost the confidence of many in Parliament, and when he announced his intention of visiting Scotland, fear and suspicion reunited Commons to abolish Episcopacy. While the king was in Scotland, the news of the Protestant massacre in Ireland electrified England; between four and five thousands had been slaughtered and a greater number had died of cold and hunger. Rumors exaggerated the number and attributed this disaster to the Roman Catholic Queen; such was popularly regarded as a rehearsal of what would happen in England if Henrietta Maria and her husband ever regained absolute power. Parliament passed the Grand Remonstrance, which listed the wrongs which the nation had suffered and called for a synod of English and foreign divines to disduss the basis for "'the intended reformation;'"[2] the voting on the Grand Remonstrance divided the House into two parties, as did the vote on the control of the army; all agreed to raise an army to revenge the Protestants in Ireland, but the Puritan party was reluctant to subject

1. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 179.
2. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 182.

it to the control of the king. When he returned from his Scottish trip, Charles brought with him a guard of "cavalier" officers who were quick to use their swords against the taunting mobs which gathered around Whitehall and the palaces of the bishops; when a crowd threatened to do violence to Williams, now Archbishop of York, one of these officers (David Hyde) whipped out his sword and threatened to "cut the throats of those roundheaded dogs that bawled against Bishops."[1] On January 3, 1641/2, the king had impeachment proceedings initiated in the House of Lords against five of the leading members of Commons; this reunited Parliament against the king. The next day Charles, with four hundred of his cavaliers, stormed into Commons to arrest his prey, but they, having been warned, had escaped. As soon as the king had withdrawn with his "guard," desperate action was taken to prevent a possible massacre of the members of Parliament. The train-bands of London were alerted, and four thousand volunteers marched from Buckingshire to protect their representative and hero, Hampden; the mariners of the Royal Navy marched to the Guild Hall and offered the king's supplies for the defense of Parliament. On January 10th, the king and his cavaliers fled from London; Hyde and other royalists slipped from their seats in Parliament and joined their royal master at York. Three hundred Commoners and thirty Peers remained in their seats to defy the king. Many wished to remain neutral in this struggle, but it soon became evident that there would be a war in which everyone would be forced to take sides.

1. Masson, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 331-332. Masson says that as far as he could learn this was "the first minting of the term or compellation of Roundheads, which afterwards grew so general." Ibid.

While these events were shaking the nation, the people took the liberty of discussing the issues behind them; with the breakdown of censorship and control of the press, the country was flooded with pamphlets and writings; likewise, with the breakdown of the regulations and control of the pulpit, preachers sprang up everywhere. All the pent-up thoughts and emotions of centuries suddenly burst forth into a thousand tongues, and there were prophets in every shop and preachers in every barn. Their long, intense study and pondering of the scriptures now gave courage to the humblest to speak on the most perplexing problems of faith and practice. "Conventicles" multiplied by the hundreds, and the "mechanic preacher" came into his day. Haller says:

> The success of the preachers in winning adherents to the cause of reform provoked other men of reforming tempers to express themselves not only in pulpits but in conventicles, in the streets, in shops and taverns, and always sooner or later in print. By such process the propagation of Puritanism passed more and more out of the control of Puritan churchmen, becoming at the same time more and more revolutionary. When the Stuart regime collapsed, there was consequently a host of preachers, but there was also a host of other able, energetic and enthusiastic writers ready with matter to keep the printers busy.[1]

Men like John Milton laid aside other matters and entered the struggle for liberation; condemning "the external pomp of lordliness" of the Episcopal system, Milton argues that the Church ought to depend solely upon the spiritual and moral means of discipline rather than lean upon the temporal power and suthority of the magistrate. To the claim that Prelacy keeps down schism and suppresses the sects, this gifted writer gave an answer which we cannot forbear quoting:

> If to bring a numb and chill stupidity of soul, an inactive blindness of mind, upon the people by their leaden doctrine, or

1. Haller, op. cit., pp. 5-6. Vide Ibid., p. 263.

> no doctrine at all—if to persecute all knowing and zealous Christians by the violence of their courts—be to keep away schism, they keep away schism indeed; and by this kind of discipline all Italy and Spain is as purely and politicly kept from schism as England hath been by them. With as good a plea might the Dead Palsy boast to a man, 'Tis I that free you from stitches and pains, and the troublesome feeling of cold and heat, of wounds, and strokes; if I were gone, all these would molest you.' The Winter might as well vaunt itself against the Spring, 'I destroy all noisome and rank weeds; I keep down all pestilent vapours.' Yes, and all wholesome herbs, and all fresh dews, by your violent and hidebound frost; but, when the gentle west winds shall open the fruitful bosom of the Earth thus overgirded by your imprisonment, then the flowers put forth and spring, and then the sun shall scatter the mists, and the manuring hand of the tiller shall root up all that burdens the soil, without thank to your bondage.[1]

The major concern, says Milton, should be that man should not "dishonour and profane in himself that priestly-unction & clergy-right whereto Christ hath entitled him," rather than that he, as a layman, should profane some external object by his touch.

> 'We have learnt that the scornful term of Laic, the consecrating of temples, carpets, and table-cloths, the railing-in of a repugnant and contradictive Mount Sinai in the Gospel (as if the touch of a lay Christian, who is nevertheless God's living temple, could profane dead judaisms), the exclusion of Christ's people from the offices of holy discipline through the pride of a usurping clergy, causes the rest to have an unworthy and abject opinion of themselves, to approach to holy duties with a slavish fear, and to unholy doings with a familiar boldness.'[2]

Considering ordination as "an outward sign or symbol of admission" which neither creates nor confers anything, Milton says:

> 'It is the inward calling of God that makes a minister, and his own painful study and diligence that manures and improves his ministerial gifts. In the primitive time, many before ever they had received ordination from the Apostles had done the Church noble service—as Apollos and others. It is but an orderly form of receiving a man already fitted, and committing to him a particular charge.'[3]

1. John Milton, "The Reason of Church government urg'd against Prelaty," (1641), ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 372-373.
2. Ibid., pp. 374-375.
3. John Milton, "Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defence against Semctymnuus," (1641), ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. II, p. 267.

In his fourth anti-episcopal pamphlet, Milton makes a distinction between preaching and discipline:

> 'Public Preaching is the gift of the Spirit, working as best seems to his secret will; but Discipline is the practic work of preaching directed and applied as is most requisite to particular duty. . . .'[1]

These writings of Milton must have been welcomed by such men as John Spencer, who, in 1641, published A Short Treatise concerning the lawfulness of every mans exercising his gift as God shall call him thereunto. Spencer argues that we read of no private gifts or private Christians in the Scripture and that the gifts which the Spirit gives are given for the good of the whole body. To prove "the lawfulnesse of all to exercise the gifts as God shall give them opertunitie with conveniency," Spencer cites Rom. 12:6, Ephes. 4:11-12, Ephes. 5:11, Heb. 3:13, I Cor. 14:31, I Peter 4:10, and gives the following reasons to show "why every one ought to communicate of what God hath bestowed on them for the good of the whole body:"

> the first reason is because God himselfe hath commanded it. The second reason is, because it was the very end of Gods bestowing these gifts upon us, for the edifying of the body of Christ. The third reason is from our neere union and communion one with another. The fourth reason is from our breathrens right to it, they have all right to our gifts and abilities. The fifth reason is this, it is the way to inlarge our owne gifts and abilities. The sixt reason is, Gods glory and the Saints example. The seven reason is because of our enemies wiles, and fathans malice, all calling for it at our hands.[2]

In answer to the objection that none ought to preach but those in office, Spencer says that in the scriptures we have cases of the preaching of men and women who held no office in the church: Acts 11:19-21, John 4:39,

1. Milton, "The Reason of Church Government," etc., ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. II, p. 379.
2. John Spencer, A Short Treatise Concerning the lawfulness of every mans exercising his gift as God shall call him thereunto. (London: for Iohn Spencer), 1641, p. 3.

Luke 8:38-39, Numbers 11:29, I Sam. 6:10. To those who argue that all these had an extraordinary spirit given to them, Spencer replies that only to those who wrote the Scriptures or worked miracles was such a spirit given and that none of these performed miracles or wrote Scripture yet they all prophesied. "Such a Spirit as that they had, Is promised to the people of God, in our dayes." (Acts 2:18) If this promise had been made good in the Apostles' time which then must have been "the last times," how much more may we now look for the fulfilling of this promise![1] To the second objection that none be fit for the worke of the ministry unless he be skilled in arts and tongues, Spencer replies that the Scriptures (I Cor. 2:12-14) plainly affirms that true understanding of scripture comes not by humane learning but by the spirit of God (I Cor. 2:10); God counts it his glory sometimes to hide things from the wise and prudent and to reveal them unto babes and sucklings (Matt. 11:25, Proverbs 1:6-7, Psalms 25:12). The apostle did not pray for skill in arts and tongues but that God would give the spirit of wisdom (Eph. 1:17). The third objection, that none ought to exercise these gifts in such a public way but those that have a call to it, Spencer replies that

> all the call mentioned of in holy scriptures, was the peoples great necessity, and their great willingnesse to heare them and receive them. And the aprobation of godly ministers, and all this I have had for my call, but if none might Preach the Gospell, unlesse he had the consent of all, None should preach amongst us . . .[2]

To the fourth objection that gifts given to a private Christian may be exercised in his own home (that is, privately), but not in the church (that is, publicly), Spencer answers that there is no member of the of the body of Christ but is of the same nature of the whole, a public

1. Spencer, "A Short Treatise," pp. 4-5.
2. Ibid., p. 6.

member of a public body; as the spirit proceeding from the head to every member is one, so are all his gifts for the good of the whole body. There can be no private member of Christ, no private Christian; "in the whole booke of God, we finde no such phrase as private Christian, or private spirit." To the last objection that although it be lawful for every man to use his gifts as God shall call him, it is not proper at this time because "happily it might hinder the worke of reformation," the answer is given that in the work of reformation "it is necessary that all errors should be brought to light." Spencer concludes with saying that the times call for every man's witness; however,

> could it be made aparent out of Gods word, that it were unlawfull for me to goe on in this way, or that there were no neede of the discovery of Christ in the world, or that the people did not earnestly desire it, I should cease with Joy and reioycing of heart; but so long as there can be nothing found in Gods word against it, and seeing the great necessities of the people and their great willingnesse calles for it; I shall be willing to suffer what God shall please to inflict upon me for the same. . . .[1]

There were others who were also willing to suffer for their witness. When Laud's power was broken, religious exiles returned from Holland and New England, and the long suppressed Separatists emerged from their hiding places; in 1641 Bishop Hall informed the House of Lords that in London and its immediate neighborhood there were "'no fewer than four score congregations of several sectaries, instructed by guides fit for them, cobblers, tailors, felt-makers, and such like trash.'"[2] Within the first weeks of the Long Parliament the constables broke into one of these "conventicles" and brought six of its leading members before the House of Lords; when they answered that they only met to

1. Spencer, "A Short Treatise," p. 8.
2. Ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. II, p. 587.

teach and to edify one another in Christ, they were admonished not to assemble again and were discharged.[1] However, some of the Peers were not displeased at their meetings and on the next Sunday attended their services, where they heard two sermons, received the Lord's Supper, contributed to the poor, and promised to come again.[2] In A Discourse Opening the Nature of That Episcopacie, which is Exercised in England" (1641), Robert Greville, Lord Brooke, whom Haller describes as "a chivalrous Englishman and disinterested lover of truth,"[3] pleads for the liberty of unlicensed preaching as nobly as Milton did for unlicensed printing. While denying any personal connection or agreement with the separatist or sectarian, Brooke argues that although truth is one, yet men understand it differently and that what is called heresy might be only what men, under persecution, mistook for truth. No man has a complete possession of truth, he says, for "'the wayes of Gods Spirit are free, and not tied to a University man;'" the light may shine upon the humble and ignorant and move them to inquire, to search for more light, to discuss and to speak out what they have found of truth. He regards the tub-preachers as harmless, well-meaning men who, having heard God's promise to pour his Spirit upon all flesh,

> '. . . though this were begun to be accomplished even in our Saviours time, yet they (perhaps through ignorance) Expect it should be yet still more and more accomplished every day, till Knowledge cover the Earth, as Waters fill the Sea; even till there be no more need that any man should teach his neighbor, for all men shall know the Lord; and they poore men expect a new Heaven, and a new Earth, wherein there shall neede be no more Temples of stone, but all good men shall be Prophets, Priests, and Kings.

1. Vide Lords Journal, Jan 16-Jan. 18, 1640/41. The names of these six were: Edmund Chillendon, Nicholas Tyne, John Webb, Thomas Gunn, Joseph Ellis and Richard Sturges.

2. Vide Hanbury's Memorials, vol. II, pp. 66-68, ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. II, p. 588.

3. Haller, op. cit., p. 336.

> in the meane time they say Waters must flow out of the bellies of all that believe, till at length the great Waters of the Sanctuary flow forth without measure.'[1]

Haller says that Brooke "perceived and expressed the need for allaying fear of the popular sects and for toleration of religious differences."[2]

There was need of allaying the fear of the sects, because already in 1641 there were men who were trying to discredit the parliamentarians by satirizing and slandering the independent preachers. In A Swarme of Sectaries and Schismatiques," John Taylor, "the water-poet," presents the medieval concept of a harmonious society and condemns "that precious crew" of "mechanick preachers" who presume to preach without being either called or sent. After naming several cases of merchants, basket-makers, etc. who left their "callings" to preach and who later had to leave England because of their immoral conduct, Taylor says:

> These kind of Vermin swarm like Caterpillars
> And hold Conventicles in Barnes and Sellars,
> Some preach (or prate) in woods, in fields, in stable,
> In hollow-trees, in tubs, on tops of Tapor,
> They tosse the holy Scripture into Vapor:
> These are the Rabshekaes that raile so bitter,
> (Like mungrill whelpes of Hells infernall litter)
> Against that Church that baptiz'd and bred them,
> And like a loving mother, nurst & fed them,
> With milk, with strong meats, with the bread of life,
> Like a true mother, and our Saviours wife.[3]

To "a zealous cobler" (Howe who preached that the Spirit alone is teacher and that as Christ chose the poor and unlearned so

> . . . God still being God (as he was then)
> Still gives his Spirit to unlearned men,

1. Brooke, A Discourse Opening the Nature of That Episcopacie, 1641. Ut per Haller, op. cit., pp. 337-338.
2. Haller, op. cit., p. 338.
3. John Taylor, A Swarme of Sectaries, and Schismatiques: wherein is discovered the strange preaching (or prating) of such as are by their trades Coblers, Tinkers, Pedlers, Weavers, Sow Gelders, and Chymney-Sweepers . . . (2 lines), 1641, (Bodleian Library), p. 7.

Such as are Barbers, Mealmen, Brewers, Bakers,
Religious Sowgelders, and Button-makers.[1]

Taylor replies that at Pentecost Christ endowed his disciples with a learning far exceeding that of all the universities; if the cobblers, tinkers and such believe they have so large a measure of the Spirit, let them speak in tongues, work miracles and convert whole nations.

Since Uzzah for his good will to hold up
The falling Ark, did taste deathes bitter cup;
Since those that once to looke into it dar'd,
Or those that toucht Mount Sinai were not spar'd,
What can a Cobler look for, or a Knave,
Who in the Church (or Arke) no function have
Yet dares more saucily to preach and prate
Against all orders, learning, Church, and State.[2]

An anonymous pamphlet, The Brownists Synagogue, gives the names of the Separatist teachers and the places of their conventicles that "well affected Christians" might complain of them to the authorities, for unless they be suppressed, says the writer, "this kingdom will never be free from Divisions, disturbances, and distractions." An Irreverend Glover, Richard Rogers, calls a congregation at his house in Blew-Anchor Alley and tells them to abhor "that Diabolicall function of the Bishops" and to gather themselves to those who, like himself, speak nothing but that which the Spirit gives for utterance. Irremy Manwood can be heard in Goate Alley, once a fortnight; Edward Gyle meets the holy Brothers in Checker-Alley, and preaches that the guilded Cross in Cheapside is idolatrous and ought to be abolished; Marler, a Button-maker in Aldersgate-street, preaches that every man should follow his own calling but reckons himself among the children of the Prophets and robs the Levi of his due. John Tucke has a Convocation in Fleet-lane

1. Taylor, A Swarme of Sectaries, p. 10.
2. Ibid., p. 16.

and preaches that the Book of Common Prayer originated from the mass. Humphrey Gosnold, who teaches near Tower-hill, keeps his hair long that he might be known a Precisian and compares the organs in Paul's Church to the roaring of the Bulls of Basan. Jonas Hawkins, a Fisherman, and John Brumley in Chancery Lane are zealots of the Separation; Roger Kennet, a Yorkeshire man, tells a company "nigh" the Royal Exchange that none can be saved but those which are of "their Elect." Edward Iohnson, a Chandlor, teaches an assembly in More-lane that "the house, field or Wood wherein their Congregation meets, is the Church of God, and not the churches we meet in, because the good and bad come both thither, neither is it lawful to have any Society with the wicked." John Bennet, "near Love lane in Westmin.," discredits all human learning because Christ's apostles were fishermen. In the Minories, George Dunny calls his followers "the seperated Saints" and condemns the capes and surplices as "the Garments of the Babilonish Whore." Charles Thomas, a Weschman, teaches once in a fortnight in Warwick-lane; he holds "none lawfull to be amongst the Prophets, but those who were inspired by the Spirit, so no man is fit for their holy service, but devout men, and who is familiar with the Spirit." Alexander Smith, preaches to a congregation in Shorditch that "no man ought to teach but whom the spirit moves." Edmund Nicholson teaches in an Alley in Seacole-lane that the Elect and pure in Spirit are chosen vessels.

> . . . now I come to the two Arch-Separatists, Greene and Spencer, both which are accounted as Demy-Gods, they keep no constant place, but are here, and every where, the one of them is a Feltmaker, which is Greene, the other a Coachman, both which called an Assembly upon Tuesday being the 28. of Septemb. in Houndsditch, the tenor of his Doctrine was this, That the Bishops function is an Antichristian calling, and the Deanes and Prebends, are the Frogs and Locusts mentioned in the Revelation, there is none of these Bishops (saith he) but hath a Pope in their bellies, yea they are Papists in grain,

> they are all of them unleavened soules, & we have turned them over to be buffetted by Satan, and such like Shismaticall Phrases, as the evill Spirit moves him.[1]

We are told that in their services, "the man appointed to teach" begins by praying "about the space of halfe an houre" and then preaches about "an houre," after which "another stand up to make the text more plaine."[2]

In an epistle addressed to John Greene, "a private friend" rebukes him and Spencer for taking upon themselves to be ambassadors of God to teach their teachers and to be ministers of the Gospel.

> . . . .it is not the custome of any well settled Church in Europe to ordain such as you, I meane Hatmakers, Coblers, Taylors, Horsekeepers; upon one and the same day to be plancke and the Pulpit, in the forenoone making a hat, or rubbing a horse, in the afternoone preaching a Sermon.[3]

To Greene's claim of having "an inward calling," the friend says that such a claim is nothing of itself and that "our Church hath no need of such as you, unlearned, a selfe-conceited hatmaker."

> It is true, that in the beginning of Queene Elizabeths reigne, the Popish Priests and Friers being dismissed, there was a scarcity for the present of learned men, and so some tradesmen were permitted to leave their trades, and betake themselves to the ministry; but it was necessity that did then constraine so to doe: but thankes bee to God we have now no such necessity, and therefore this practice of you and your comragues casts an ill apersion upon our good God, that doth furnish our Church plentifully with learned men; and it doth also scandalize our Church, as if we stood in need of such as you to preach the Gospell. . . .[4]

Asking where were their miracles if they truly had the Spirit as did the Apostles, the writer relates that one of their group

> told the Lords in the Parliament, that they were all preachers, for so they practise and exercise themselves as young players

1. [John Taylor?], The Brownists Synagogue or a Late Discovery of their conventicles, assemblies; and places of meeting, . . . (7 lines), 1641, (British Museum), pp. 2-5.
2. Ibid., pp. 7-8.
3. [John Taylor?], New Preachers, New. Greene the Feltmaker, Spencer the Horse-Rubber, Quartermine the Brewers Clarke, with some few others, . . . (6 lines), 1641, (British Museum), p. 7.
4. Ibid.

> doe in private, till they bee by their brethren judged fit for the pulpit, and then up they goe, and like Mountebanks play their parts . . .[1]

The Brownists Conventicle describes the welcome extended to one Samuel Eaton who had lately returned from New England; after two or three hours of preaching, "our learned Felt-maker" was invited to another brother's house for dinner. After a special thanksgiving for each dish, Eaton said: "And now let us fall too, and feed exceedingly, that after our full repass, we may the better prophesie." At the conclusion of the dinner there was another prayer for "all the Saints gathered and assembled whether in any private houses within the city, or in any cow house, Barne, or Stable without the wals or whether in the fields, woods, or groves, wheresoever the holy Assembly is convented and gathered."[2] In their afternoon exercise, one of the Elders preached on Revelation 12:7, interpreting the great Dragon as the "Devil of Lambeth with the Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, etc. as his wicked angels."

The Brothers of the Separation relates a service held in the house of one Mr. Porters in Goat Alley after a former service (14th of August) had been interrupted and its chiefs committed to prison; preaching on Leviticus 1:14, John Rogers, a glover, reminds his brethren that they had been betrayed by two unclean birds, the crow which wears black like "our clergy," and the magpie which has the cross on his back as the Popes disciples have. Rogers is reported to have said:

> 'If the spirit of the flesh doe move a brother of the separation so strongly that he cannot resist it, I perswade

1. [Taylor?], New Preachers, p. 7.
2. The Brownists Conventicle: or an assembly of Brownists, Separatists, and Non-Conformists, . . . (12 lines), 1641, (British Museum), p. 5.

> myselfe that he is not to be faulted, alwaies provided that he doth not pollute himselfe with the wicked, but make use of a sister of the separation.'[1]

The Discovery of a Swarme of Separatists gives an account of an assembly at the house of Burboon, a leather-seller, in Fleet Street; to an audience of a hundred and fifty, Burboon preached for about five hours,

> crying divers times, as was audibly heard, Hell and Damnation, telling them they were all damned, he did speake likewise much against the Booke of Common Prayer, against the Bishops and many others . . .[2]

"Divers men" and apprentices who came in from the street became impatient of the new-coined doctrines of the leather-seller and "began to make a combustion therabouts and on a suddaine broke down all the glasse windowes." The constable prevented the apprentices and others from pulling down the house, but in the scuffle,

> many of the said Brownists crawled over the Tyles, and houses, escaping some one way, and some another. But at length they catcht one of them alone, but they kickt him so vehemently, as if they meant to beate him into a jelly: It is ambiguous whither they have kil'd him or no: but for a certainty they did knocke him, as if they meant to pull him in pieces. I confesse, it had beene no matter, if they had beaten their whole Tribe in the like manner.[3]

To this account of Burboon's conventicle there is added A Relation of Prophet Hunt. At the end of a sermon at St. Pulchers Church on the 19th of December (1641), James Hunt stood up and cried,

> 'Men and Brethren, I pay give eare unto my text, which is taken out of the 7 chap. of the Revel. V. 3. then he began to baule so

1. The Brothers of the Separation or, a True Relation of a Company of Brownists which kept their Conventicle at one Mr. Porters in Goat Alley . . . (7 lines), (London: Tho. Harper), 1641.
2. The Discovery of a Swarme of Separatists, or, a Leather-sellers Sermon. . . . (8 lines), (London: for John Greensmith), 1641. (British Museum).
3. Ibid.

> loud, concerning fire and water with such peremptory confidence, that there did arise a great tumultuous murmur among the Parishioners, and without much prolizity of words he was pulled downe by the Constables and others: Yet he was very confident of himselfe, for hee said, that hee was sent a messenger from God, and therefore without their contradiction he would deliver his Message: but immediately they holed him before the Lord Maior . . .[1]

When the Lord Mayor asked him is he had the Spirit and how he dared presume to preach having no warrant for the ministerial function, he replied that "he had sufficient warrant from God, for he knew that he was his Messenger, and as for the Spirit he was confident that he had that, which he sayd they apparently might conceive by the fruites thereof."[2] The Lord Mayor, "at lenght . . . perceiving his erroneous & Schismaticall obstinacie," committed him to the counter.

A True Narrative of a Combustion happening in St. Anne's Church, Aldersgate, relates that on Sunday, August 8, 1641, in the absence of the minister, "many desired their friends to go into the pulpit," and a contest arose between a stranger who was "once a Jesuit" and "Mr. Martin, the button-maker." Mr. Martin won and preached a lengthy sermon, which however, was interrupted by the churchwardens who pulled him down from the pulpit.[3]

The anonymous writer of Lucifers Lacky describes the "Brownists" as the devil's new creatures who "doe Idolize the Tub, which as they suppose doth consecrate their devotion instead of a Pulpit." Whereas this sort of people were not once a handful "now they are like to the AEgyptian Lacust covering the whole Land, and they will rule Religion,

1. The Discovery of a Swarme of Separatists
2. Ibid.
3. A True Narrative of a Combustion happening in St. Anne's Church, Aldersgate, . . . (4 lines), 1641. (British Museum).

not Religion them."[1] In one of their assemblies in the malt-house of one Job, a Brewer, "there had every one a Religion by himself, and every one a nigher way to Heaven than the other . . . but their ambitious Zeale was so hot, that in snuffe each left the other. . . ."[2]

A Tale in a Tub, or a Tub Lecture is given as an account of a sermon preached "neere Bedlam." Addressing his audience as "Beloved Sisters, and my well infected Brethren," the preacher chose as his text "Now the Babylonians had an Idoll they called Bell," which he divided into four parts: "the Time, Now. The Nation, The Babylonians. The crime, had an Idoll. The Denomination, called Bell."--

> . . . when were golden Crosses, Images & pictures suffered to stand in defiance of the Brethren . . .? My Text doth answer Now: When were lying, scurrilous pamphlets, which abuse the Brethren in prose and Verse, by the Name of Round-heads, more in Fashion than Now: . . . Beloved, these Babylonians are a Nation that inhabited Babylon, and derive their names from Nimrods Tower, Babel. . . .[3]

The word Idoll is explained as being derived from the word Idle, and the preacher says that as they had nothing else to do but to set up idols, "it shall become us to make it the business of our whole lives to pull them downe." Reminding his hearers that the crosses of Cheap-side were gold without and lead within, he exclaims: "Beloved, Lead was not made to forme Idols with, but for the good of mankind, which is to make Bullets, and Tyle Houses." The name of the idol was Bell which is derived from that "general enemy to mankind, Belze-bub, one whom we all know to be the Devill;" there is never any good in that word where Bell

1. Lucifers Lacky, or, The Devils new Creature, . . . (7 lines), (London: Printed for John Greensmith), 1641, (British Museum).
2. Ibid.
3. J. T., A Tale in a Tub, or a Tub Lecture As it was delivered by My-heele Mendsoale, an Inspired Brownist, . . . (4 lines), (London), 1641, (British Museum).

has a share—as a Bel-man, or a Troy Bel which those "blads (Cavaleroes) call a crosse Bard sword," or those persecuting Irish Re-bels.

> I could proceed further and would but for feare of the law, who if I should be too zealous, would censure this Lecture to be a Libell, therefore, this shall suffice at this time, next meeting shall perfect the work begun; repair to your houses and consider of these sayings, Farewell.[1]

A full and Compleat Answer to A Tale in a Tub was made by "Thorny Ailo" in 1642. Persuading himself that "the two thread-bare letters of I. T." stood for Iohn Taylor, the author says that "he should have preferred a Boat before a tub to make a pulpit of, for . . . a fishers boate once served the best Preacher that ever was, for a Canonicall Pulpit." The author then tells of a people, "somewhere beyond the unknowne Southerne World" who once a year offer their old shoes and boats to their Heathen Gods;

> O what a mighty trade might a preaching Cobler drive there being able alone of himselfe, to prepare and offer the Sacrifice, and so preach the oblation Sermon too, I know a worthy member fit to be an assistant to him, one that is originally a Heele-maker, but now he is an inspired expounder, there are so many of us now a dayes in England, that some may bee well spared into other countryes.[2]

The names of many "worthy and zealous Brethren" and their trades are presented in a "catalogue of remembrance:" Mr. How the Cobbler, the most industrious Mr. Walker the Ironmonger, the zealous Mr. Greene the Felt-maker, the painful Mr. Spencer the Stablegroom, the "pavior of Monmouth," the Sowgelder of Wallingford, the Barber and Baker of Abingdon, and "many hundreds more of true religious Millers, Weavers . . . and Taylors." One Mr. Squire, a taylor at Roderhitch, is "a

1. J. T., A Tale in a Tub
2. Thorny Ailo, A full and Compleat Answer against the Writer of a late Volume set forth, entitled A Tale in a Tub, or a Tub Lecture, . . . (5 lines), (London: Printed for F. Cowles, T. Bates, and T. Banks), 1642, (British Museum), pp. 4-5.

mighty paines taker for us all in the true way of rayling downe Learning, wit, order and deceny" although he may now and then stretch sliver lace on a pitticoat to save a yard out of four." The last one to be named in "one of our chiefe prope and pillers"--a Brewers clarke who "couragiously attempted the downfall of the Babell Crosse in Cheapside, if he had been but valiantly seconded hee would have laid it levell with the pavement."[1]

Iohn Taylor tells us more about Walker in The Whole Life and Progresse of Henry Walker the Ironmonger (1642). After serving as an apprentice to an ironmonger in Newgate Market, Henry Walker set up that trade in divers places in London until "his Trade and hee fell at odds one with the other" and he "with a gadding braine walk'd and found out a softer occupation, and setting up a Booke-sellers Shop, fell to Bookeselling." In addition to this new trade, Walker began to compose such things as would be saleable to people who "loved contention, or were willing to beleeve any thing that tended to rend or shake the piece of either Church or State."[2] When he heard of the king's visit to the city, he published an attack on his majesty, "To your Tents O Israel" (I Kings 12:16), copies of which were quickly scattered throughout London. When the king was returning to Whitehall, Walker threw one of his pamphlets into his majesty's coach, for which he was arrested but later "rescued by a rabble of Rebells." Fleeing from place to place he once disguised himself in the habit of a minister and "presumed to mount into the Pulpit, at Saint Mary Magdalens, at Bermondsey in Southwark, where hee

1. Thorny Ailo, A full and Compleat Answer, pp. 6-7.
2. Iohn Taylor, The Whole Life and Progresse of Henry Walker the Ironmonger. . . . (8 lines), (London), 1642.

so handled the Text, and made such a preachment, that what with liking and disliking the people were ready to goe together by the eares." At last Walker was caught and charged with having

> invented and writ divers Pamphlets, and ther scandalous Bookes, to the great disturbance of his Majesty, and of his Liege People, a meere sower of division, an upholder of a new Government; an inventor of a new Doctrine, nay, he is become a Preacher and a deliverer of this his homour even in the Church, and openly in the Pulpit too, and on Sunday: drawing after him, and seducing poore ignorant people to the very ruine of their soules, if it were possible. This act of his, it was done with much venome, malice, bitterness and rankon . . .[1]

In reply to this pamphlet, Henry Walker published The Modest Vindication, in which he disclaims the authorship of the many sermons and pamphlets which have been "bastardly fathered upon me" and denounces the Life and Conversion as false and foolish. Walker confesses to having written the petition to the King's Majesty, "for which the Law hath passed on me," but he denies knowing anything about it being thrown into his majesty's coach. As for the charge that he preached in conventicles, Walker replies:

> . . . God knowes I am so cleare from any such action, that I was never yet a member of any separated congregation: I pray God so to heare my prayers, as I have been a faithful member of the Church of England, established by the Lawes of the Land, and free from conventicles with Papists, Brownists, anabaptists, or any factious Assemblies whatsoever . . .[2]

He admits that he desires that "there may be a Reformation of such things in the Church as by Authority shall be found fit to be reformed," but he adds that it is not for private persons to regulate the differences and dissentions in either Church or State. As for the questions

1. Iohn Taylor, The Whole Life and Progresse of Henry Walker.
2. The Modest Vindication of Henry Walker in Answer to certaine scandalous Pamphlets, forged and vented abroad in his name (without his privity.), . . . (8 lines), (London), 1642, p. 3. (British Museum).

of his calling, Walker says:

> . . . it is well known where I was born, that I was bred a Scholar, though taken from the Schoole to the shop; I returned again to that in which I most delighted, namely, learning; and remained a student in Queens Colledge in Cambridge, till not onely by a Certificate from the said Colledge, but also by a Testimonie under the hands of severall able Divines I was held fit to be received into order . . .[1]

In A Cluster of Coxcombes (1642), Taylor describes the Donatists, Publicans, Disciplinarians, Anabaptists and Brownists; he says that Browne "hath left a most pernitious and seditious traine of his sect behind him, of all trades, ages, sexes, and conditions, and when all trades faile they can make a shift to be all preachers."[2] Taylor complains that

> in these times the Church and Church-Government is not only shaken, but shattered in pieces, almost for nothing else but outward indifferent ceremonies, such as in themselves seemed offencelesse Hand-maids for their order and decency. . . . These shaddows have not only bin with violence pul'd down, but the substance which is Gods Ordinance hath bin sacrilegiously intruded and usurped upon by an impudent rabble of ignorant Mechanicks, who have dared to presume to preach, not being cal'd or sent, nor knowing how, or when, eyther to speak or hold their peace.[3]

He concludes his "Booke of Errours and Heresies" by saying that there is "but one Right way" and that it is a grief that many thousands "out of the way" do dare "to presume to call themselves Christians."[4]

An Apology For Private Preaching (Taylor?) pretends to "prove how necessary it is for a Tradesman of any degree, to preach in a Tub, teach against the back of a chaire, instruct at the Tables end,

1. Walker, The Modest Vindication, p. 6.
2. John Taylor, A Cluster of Coxcombes, or Cinquepace of five sorts of Knaves and Fooles: Namely, The Donatists, Publicans, Disciplinarians, Anabaptists, and Brownists; . . . (7 lines), (Printed for Richard Webb), 1642, (British Museum).
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.

exhorting over a Buttery-hatch, Revealing in a Basket, Reforming on a Bed-side;"[1] however, in An Honest Answer to the Late Published Apologie for Private Preaching (1642), the writer confesses of writing "in the way of Mirth" that "if you were wise enough, you should laugh at your selves." He commends their wisdom in forsaking Churches, for he says "a stable is fitter for you; and (to speak truth) a Tub is more necessary for a Cobler than a Pulpit." He reminds them that the word zeale does not signify religion and asks why they hold it impossible for a scholar to have the endowment of divine inspiration when "they manifest to the world, that any Lay-man may be inspired by the Holy Ghost to Preach and Teach." The writer asks what has divine inspiration to do with libelling against the king and his authority, defacing churches, disturbing divine service, making the House of God a place for riot, laying violent hands on preachers and tearing off their vestments, profaning the "blessed Sacrament of baptisme by bringing puppets to the Font to be christened." In showing "the nice distinction between a Papist and a Brownist," the writer says:

> Neither of them will take the Oath of allegeance and Supremacy, there methinks they might agree like Taytors, and hand together. 2. They have both the trick of wresting Scripture to their own use. 3. A Fryar is cut a Round as a Round-head, and hath as much Souse at each side of it. . . .[2]

The writer wished that the Land were clear of both of them for "they are equall Disturbers of the state, and a great injury to the weak

1. T. J., An Apology for Private Preaching. In which those Formes are warranted, or rather justified, which the malignant Sect contemne, and daily by prophane Pamphlets make ridiculous, . . . (14 lines), (Printed for R. Wood, T. Wilson, and E. Christopher,)1641/2, (Bodleian Library).

2. T. J., An Honest Answer To The Late Published Apologie For Private Preaching. . . . (17 lines), (Printed for R. Wood, T. Wilson, and E. Christopher), 1642.

and ignorant who are so distracted betwixt them both, they know not which side to hold with."[1]

By making a grim specter of the sectarians, these writings endeavored to discredit the king's opposition, as if its chiefs were mad tub-preachers. Even the king, in his speech to his supporters at Nottingham (August 22, 1642), declared: "'You shall meet with no enemies but traitors, most of them Brownists, anabaptists, and atheists; such who desire to destroy both church and state.'"[2] Charles, doubtlessly, knew he was exaggerating the importance of the monor religious groups; for while these independents were allied with the Parliament, the major strength of the king's opposition lay, at that time, in the more conservative Puritans and in the Parliamentarians who sought a more representative government. Although religion was an important factor in the struggle, with the Puritans generally supporting the Parliament and the Anglicans and Roman Catholics generally supporting the king, the war was not primarily a religious one. A conscientious man like Colonel Hutchinson studied the issues involved until he became

> convinced in conscience of the righteousness of the parliament's cause in point of civil right; and though he was satisfied of the endeavours to reduce popery and subvert the true protestant religion which indeed was apparent to every one that impartiall considered it, yet he did not think that so clear a ground for the war as the just English liberties . . .[3]

Cromwell later confessed that "Religion was not the thing at first contested for 'at all'"[4] and that he would never satisfy himself "of

1. T. J., An Honest Answer.
2. Ut per Dale, op. cit., p. 258.
3. Hutchinson, Memoirs, vol. I, p. 137.
4. Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches: with Elucidations by Thomas Carlyle, (Copyright Ed., 5 vols. London: Chapman and Hall, 1849), IV, 94.

the justness of this War, but from the Authority of the Parliament to maintain itself in its rights."[1] Neither was the war primarily a social one, for there was a general mixture of classes on both sides, even with many families divided.[2] However, Mrs. Hutchinson tells us that most of the gentry were loyal to the king and that "most of the middle sort, the able substantial freeholders, and the other commons, who had not their dependence upon the malignant nobility and gentry, adhered to the parliament."[3] The war began as a constitutional struggle between the Crown and Parliament. The king understood this when, in reply to the Nineteen Propositions, he said that they would strip him of all real authority, leaving a crown and scepter, "but as to true and real power, we should remain but the outside, but the picture, but the sign of a King." Likewise, Ludlow understood the dispute to be

> 'whether the King should govern as a god by his will and the nation be governed by force like beasts; or whether the people should be governed by laws made by themselves, and live under a government derived from their own consent.'[4]

This issue was to be fought out to its bitter end, with both sides rejecting those who suggested a compromise.

Parliament had two major advantages over the king: the allegiance of the fleet with its control of the seas and the support of London with its financial assets, both of which played significant parts in achieving the victory. The king had two major advantages over the Parliament:

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, p. 170.
2. Vide Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Great Civil War, 1642-1649 (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1894), I, 11.
3. Hutchinson, Memoirs, vol. I, p. 141. Vide Reliquiae Baxterianae, pp. 30-31.
4. Ut per J. R. Tanner, English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century 1603-1689 (Cambridge: University Press, 1948), 117-118.

his royal personage and his spirited cavalry. It was hard for men to take up arms against their king; although they might scoff at the Stuart theory of Divine Right and condemn Charles for his blunders, none denied that he was "the Lord's anointed;" the very war against him was undertaken "to protect" his personage which was not only to trouble the consciences of many of the opposing leaders in that day but was to haunt the minds of Englishmen for centuries. The cavaliers gave the king a less enduring advantage, but a very significant one; upon seeing the initial defeats of the Parliamentary forces, Cromwell told John Hampden:

> Your troops are most of them old decayed serving-men, and tapsters, and such kind of fellows; and . . . their troops are gentlemen's sons, younger sons and persons of quality: do you think that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen, that have honour and courage and resolution in them? . . . You must get men of a spirit: . . . of a spirit that is likely to go on as far as gentlemen will go:-- or else you will be beaten still.[1]

While Hampden thought this notion an impractical one, Cromwell returned to the eastern counties (1643) and "raised such men as had the fear of God before them, as made some conscience of what they did."[2] Cromwell chose men after his own heart, combining strict military discipline with religious zeal; Whitlocke described Cromwell's men in these words:

> 'He had a brave regiment of horse, of his countrymen, most of them freeholders and freeholders' sons, and who upon matter of conscience engaged in this quarrel, and under Cromwell. And thus, being well armed within by the satisfaction of their own consciences, and without by good iron arms, they would, as one man, stand firmly and charge desperately.'[3]

Already in September of 1643, Cromwell was criticized for accepting sectarians in his company and for making officers of men from the lower

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol, V, p. 12.
2. Ibid., p. 13.
3. Whitlocke, ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. II, p. 450.

social classes; in a letter to Oliver St. John, he denied that his troops were Anabaptists and said that they were "honest sober Christians" who expected to be used as men.[1] To Sir William Spring and Mr. Barrow, he wrote:

> Gentlemen, it may be it provokes some spirits to see such plain men made Captains of Horse. It had been well that men of honour and birth had entered into these employments:—but why do they not appear? Who would have hindered them? But seeing it was necessary the work must go on, better plain men than none;—but best to have men patient of wants, faithful and conscientious in their employment. And such, I hope, these will approve themselves to be.[2]

By no means was Cromwell alone in his concern for the religious life of the soldiers. Firth says that when the war began, Essex's Army was well supplied with ministers; numbers of them arrived at the headquarters on 7th September 1642 and immediately began preaching.[3] John Vicars tells us that during the battle of Edgehill

> 'the reverend and renowned Master Marshall, Master Ashe, Master Mourton, Masters Obadiah and John Sedgwick, and Master Wilkins, and divers others eminently pious and learned pastors rode up and down the army through the thickest dangers, and in much personal hazard, most faithfully and courageously exhorting and encouraging the soldiers to fight valiantly and not to fly, but now, if ever, to stand to it and fight for their religion and laws!'[4]

However, the very battle which caused Cromwell to prepare for a long, hard war seemed enough for most of the participating clergymen; Firth says, "after Edgehill most of the ministers went home," where they claimed other duties had called them.[5]

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, p. 148.
2. Ibid., p. 153.
3. Vide C. H. Firth, Cromwell's Army, A History of the English Soldier During the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, 2nd ed., (London: Methuen & Co., 1912), 313-314.
4. Ut per Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 315.
5. Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 316. Vide Ibid., p. 409 for the Articles of War dealing with religious duties of soldiers.

On June 12, 1643, Parliament issued an Ordinance, calling for

> . . . an Assembly of learned and godly Divines to be consulted with by the Parliament, for the settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England, and for Vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretation.[1]

Although the king denounced it as unauthorized, on July 1, 1643, such an assembly convened in Westminster Abbey and proceeded to discuss the religious settlement. Among the instructions and rules which Parliament sent to the Assembly was this notable one: "What any man undertakes to prove as necessary, he shall make good out of Scripture."[2] However, the political and military situation forced the religious settlement; to check the agitation for "an accommodation with his Majesty" and to get the military assistance of the Scots which they desperately needed, the Parliamentarians took (Sept. 25, 1643) the Solemn League and Covenant, which "practically committed England to Presbyterianism."[3] Although the English had wanted a civil agreement, the Scots had held out for a religious compact which would commit its signers to preserve the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland and to reform the religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland "according to the Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches;" the Covenant also committed its signers to endeavor to bring the churches in the three kingdoms to "the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship and catechising," and

1. Ut per George Gillespie, Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster, ed. David Meek (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846), vii.
2. John Lightfoot, The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines, from January 1, 1643 to December 31, 1644, ed. John Rogers Pitman (London: J. F. Dove, 1824), 4.
3. Drysdale, op. cit., pp. 290-291.

to extirpate popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, profaneness and "whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness."[1] Article three of the Covenant declares:

> We shall with the same sincerity, reality and constancy, in our several vocations, endeavour with our estates and lives mutually to preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliaments, and the liberties of the kingdoms, and to preserve and defend the King's Majesty's person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms, that the world may bear witness with our consciences of our loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to deminish His Majesty's just power and greatness.[2]

While it brought the needed assistance of the Scottish Army, the Covenant also brought a division among the Parliamentarians and created, out of the conservative Puritans, a Presbyterian political party whose fortunes became tied to the accomplishments of the Scottish Army. The Scottish commissioners entered the Assembly, and although they had no vote, Alexander Henderson, Samuel Rutherford, Robert Baillie and George Gillespie exerted tremendous influence on its proceedings. Robert Baillie relates (Dec. 7, 1643) that upon their first coming into the Assembly, they found a group of Independent men (some ten or eleven) arguing for "the divine institution of a Doctor in everie congregation as well as a Pastor;" there was also a division over the institution of the ruling elder, which the dissenters were willing to admit "in a prudentiall way" but the majority rejected. As for the issue of Independency, Baillie writes,

> we purpose not to medle in haste, till it please God to advance our armie, which we expect will much assist our arguments. However, we are not desperate of some accomodation; for Goodwin, Burroughs, and Bridge, are men full, as it seems yet, of grace and modestie: if

1. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 268-269.
2. Ibid.

> they should prove otherwise, the bodie of the Assemblie and Parliament, citie and countrie, will disclaime them.[1]

However, the question of ordination opened the issue of Independency not only in the Assembly but in Parliament and in the nation as well. The core of contention was the proposition, "that so single congregation which may conveniently join together in an association, may assume unto itself all and sole power of ordination;" also trouble arose over the proposition "that Presbyteries have the key of discipline as well as of doctrine, with disciplinary jurisdiction over both ministers and congregations."[2] Against these propositions, the minority argued for the autonomy of each separate congregation, independent of any external authority; when the Assembly approved the Directory for Ordination in spite of their opposition, the Dissenters appealed to Parliament. In a publication, "An Apologetical Narration," (1643) they described their sufferings both in England and abroad, stated their principles of church government and declared that it was not their way "'to make our present judgment and practice a binding law unto ourselves for the future.'"[3] True to the spirit of Robinson and Smyth, these men declared for "the principle of progressive revelation,"[4] which appealed to many in the seventeenth century; not only did the seekers and speculators in religion rally under the banner of Independency which they raised, but they also attracted men like Milton who thought

> 'New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large'

and who "recoiled alike from the bonds of Presbyterianism and the bonds

1. Robert Baillie, Letters and Journals (3 vols., Edinburgh: Alex, Lawrie & Co., 1841), II, 110-111.
2. Drysdale, op. cit., p. 300.
3. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., p. 429.
4. Tanner, op. cit., p. 128.

of episcopacy."[1] Baillie denounced the "Apologetical Narration" as a "slie and cunning" petition for toleration;[2] Thomas Edwards declared that as Parliament had already taken the Covenant, "the Apologie and motion for a Toleration comes too late, the doore is shut against it, the Kingdomes hands are bound."[3] In Reasons Against the Independant Government of Particular Congregations, (1641), Edwards had predicted that if men were permitted to forsake the public assemblies "where they may enjoy worthy and pretious Pastors, after Gods owne heart" and to make their own churches that they would choose for ministers "some Taylor, Felt-maker, Button-maker, men ignorant and low in parts, by whom they shall be let into sinne and errors;"[4] he had been astonished when he was answered by a "she-Brownist," Katherine Childley, "a member of some hole-and-corner congregation in London."[5] In Antapologia, Edwards blames Goodwin, Nye, Burroughes and other Independent leaders for the swarm of sectaries which had invaded England; he describes their toleration as "a kind of Invitation" to all kinds of errors;

> if the devill had his choice, whether the Hierarchie, Ceremonies and Lyturgie should be established in this Kingdome, or a Toleration granted, he would chuse and preferre a Toleration before them, and would willingly part with, and give up all those for a Toleration of divers Sects and different Churches.[6]

There came to the Assembly nearly every day reports of "the increase of

1. Vide Tanner, op. cit., p. 128
2. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 130.
3. Thomas Edwards, Antapologia: Or, a Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration, . . . (26 lines),(London:Printed by G. M.), 1644, pp. 282-283.
4. Tho. Edwards, Reasons Against the Independant Government of Particular Congregations, . . . (8 lines), (London: Richard Cotes), 1641, p. 23.
5. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. II, p. 595.
6. Edwards, Antapologia, p. 304.

Anabaptists, Antinomians, and other sectaries,"[1] who gathered under such illiterate leaders as cobblers, tinkers and weavers; the Presbyterian divines believed that the only way to save the country was by silencing such presumptuous men and by establishing a devout and orthodox ministry.[2] The Covenant had practically pledged the nation to such an end, and the plan of church-government, approved by the majority in the Assembly, called for that fulfillment. However, when the Presbyterian form of church government was presented to Parliament (Nov. 15, 1644), it encountered immediate opposition; Parliament was not willing to surrender its authority in ecclesiastical matters and the plan was lost in the "Erastian Controversy" until the events of war and state wrought a solution quite different than either the Assembly or Parliament approved.[3]

The idea of religious toleration was more acceptable to Cromwell, who realized that nothing could be settled until the king was defeated. To assist in the achievement of that end he had raised a cavalry of "spirited men," without using religious orthodoxy as a prerequisite to their enlistment; he was displeased at the efforts of some Presbyterian ministers and officers to exclude "heretics" from the army; when Major-General Crawford suspended a colonel because of his religious views, Cromwell wrote (March 10, 1643/4):

> Surely you are not well advised thus to turn-off one so faithful to the Cause, and so able to serve you as this man is. . . . Ay, but the man 'is an Anabaptist.' Are you sure of that? Admit he be, shall that render him incapable to serve the Public? 'He is indiscreet.' It may be so, in some things: we have all human infirmities. . . .
> Sir, the State, in choosing men to serve it, takes no notice of their opinions; if they be willing faithfully to serve it,—

1. Vide Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 111.
2. Vide Dale, op. cit., p. 277.
3. Vide Drysdale, op. cit., pp. 302-303.

> that satisfies. . . . Take heed of being sharp, or too easily sharpened by others, against those to whom you can object little but that they square not with you in every opinion concerning matters of religion. . . .[1]

At Marston Moor (July 2, 1644) every man was welcomed; Scottish Presbyterians stood shoulder to shoulder with the East Anglican Independents, asking no questions of each other's faith, as they prepared for the greatest battle of the war. Surveying the opposing armies, Rupert, the king's best general, asked about only one man: "Is Cromwell there?" There were religious services on both sides; Rupert heard a sermon on rebellion, and from across the ditch that divided the two forces came the low murmur of psalms. The afternoon waned; when Rupert retired for supper, the Parliamentary armies attacked. Within a few hours, the king's forces had suffered a major defeat. A special thanks was voted to Cromwell for "the faithful service performed by him in the late battle near York, where God made him a special instrument in obtaining that great victory;" the House also passed (Sept. 13, 1644) an order for all those bodies concerned with the settlement of Church government

> to endeavour the finding out some way how far tender consciences, who cannot in all things submit to the common rule which shall be established, may be borne with according to the Word, and as may stand with the public peace.[2]

In a letter to Mr. Dickson (Sept. 16, 1644), Baillie complains that this was done "without any regards to us who have saved their nation" and describes it as "the fruit of their disservice, to obtaine really ane Act of Parliament for their tolleration, before we have gotten any thing for Presbyterie either in Assemblie or Parliament."[3] Promising his

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, pp. 160-162.
2. Gardiner, Civil War, vol. I, p. 483.
3. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 230.

correspondent that they would endeavor to redress "all these things as we may," Baillie says:

> This is a very fickle people; so wonderfullie divided in all their armies, both their Houses of Parliament, Assemblie, City, and Countrey, that it's a miracle if they fall not into the mouth of the King. . . . The great shott of Cromwell and Vane is to have a libertie for all religions, without any exceptions.[1]

Baillie and the Presbyterian majority in the Assembly were able to "redress" this proposal of toleration by presenting to the House a recommendation for "preventing the Divulging the dangerous opinions of Antinomianism and Anabaptism;" after long debate, the House resolved (November 15, 1644):

> That no Person be permitted to preach, who is not ordained a Minister, either in This, or some other Reformed Church, except such as, intending the Ministry, shall be allowed for the Trial of their Gifts, by those who shall be appointed thereunto by both Houses of Parliament.[2]

The House also resolved that "on Monday next" the Assembly's propositions concerning Church government would be considered.

However, the military situation again interrupted the Presbyterian settlement. The advantage gained at Marston Moor had not been followed up; Manchester had been reluctant to go into the south-west where Essex was defeated, and the king had been allowed to escape to Oxford. On November 25, 1644, Cromwell arose in the House and attributed the failure to secure the victory to Manchester's

> 'Unwillingness to have the war prosecuted to a full victory; and a desire to have it ended by an accommodation on some such terms to which it might be disadvantageous to bring the King too low.'[3]

1. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 230.
2. Journals of the House of Commons. 1642-1644, vol. 2. November, 15°, 1644, p. 697.
3. Ut per C. H. Firth, Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England (London: Putnam, 1947), p. 115.

Manchester retorted that he had acted on the advice of the Council of War and that Cromwell was "a factious and obstructive subordinate" who had spoken against the Presbyterian Divines and had expressed a desire to have only Independents in his army. Baillie wrote:

> This fire was long under the emmers; now it's broken out, we trust, in a good time. It's like, for the interest of our nation, we must crave reason of that darling of the sectaries, and in obtaining his removeall from the armie, which himselfe, by his oure [over]-rashness, hes procured, to breake the power of that potent faction. This is our present difficill exercise: we had need of your prayers.[1]

Rather than push his charges against Manchester, Cromwell turned to the need of re-organizing the whole army and after citing the contemporary criticism that many in Parliament were satisfied with the power and places of honor they had seized and therefore were content that the war be dragged on, Cromwell said:

> 'And I hope, we have such true English hearts and zealous affections towards the general weal of our mother country, as no members of either House will scruple to deny themselves, and their own private interests for the public good.'[2]

On December 19th, the House of Commons passed the Self-Denying Ordinance; Baillie was puzzled by such sudden action and confessed that while much could be said for and against it, "the bottom of it is not understood."[3] The House of Lords delayed passing it "on the ground that they did not know what shape the new army would take,"[4] but finally, April 3, 1645, both houses passed an ordinance which relieved all members of both houses "of and from all and every office or command, military or civil, granted or conferred by both or either of the said Houses of this

1. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 245. (Dec. 1, 1644).
2. Ut per Firth, Cromwell, pp. 117-118.
3. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 247.
4. Firth, Cromwell, p. 118.

present Parliament."[1]

Concurrently with the passing of this Ordinance the remodeling of the army had proceeded so that its reorganization was completed by Arpil. The three commands of Essex, Waller and Manchester were united under Sir Thomas Fairfax, who was given more freedom from the Committee of Both Kingdoms which formerly had handicapped military operations; the cavalry was increased, and a train of artillery was added. While the new men were not all of the caliber of Cromwell's tried troopers, the selection of the new officers followed Cromwell's standards with little regard of social distinction and religious opinions. With the regular pay which Parliament promised to pay, the officers could exert the rigorous discipline which Cromwell approved. At first the New Model Army had no regimental chaplains, but only several ministers were attached to the staff; however, later the old system was restored.[2] Such men as "honest and judicious" Edward Bowles served for a time in the new army, but men like Hugh Peters stayed longer. In Manchester's army, there had been both Presbyterian and Independent chaplains; Ashe, Goode and Lee were strong Presbyterians, while William Sedgwick and Dell were extreme Independents. Half of Manchester's infantry had been commanded by Presbyterians and the other half by Independents; but in the cavalry the Independents were in the majority. In 1644 an opponent of Cromwell wrote:

> 'If you look upon his own regiment of horse, see what a swarm there is of those that call themselves the godly; some of them profess they have seen visions and had revelations. Look at Colonel Fleetwood's regiment with his Major Harrison, what a cluster of preaching officers and troopers there is. Look what a company of troopers are thrust into other regiments by the head and shoulders,

1. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 287.
2. Vide Firth, Cromwell's Army, pp. 327-328.

> most of them Independents, whom they call godly precious men; nay, indeed, to say the truth, almost all our horse be made of the faction.'[1]

In fear that such "a cluster of preaching officers and troopers" might infect the whole new army, Parliament (April 25, 1645) repeated its former Ordinance that "no Person be permitted to preach, who is not ordained a Minister" and ordered

> that this Ordinance be forthwith printed and published: And that it be forthwith sent to Sir Thomas Fairfax; with an earnest Desire and and Recommendation from both Houses, That he take care, that this Ordinance may be duly observed in the Army: And that if any shall transgress this Ordinance, that he make speedy Representation thereof to both Houses, that the offenders may receive condign Punishment for their contempts.

It was further ordered that this ordinance be sent to the Lord Mayor of London and all the Governors, Commanders and Magistrates of all garrisons, forces, places of strength, cities, towns, forts, and ports—and that "they take care, that this ordinance be duly observed in the Places aforesaid respectively."[2] To soothe the resentment which arose against this law, "A Cleer and Just Vindication" of it was published for the soldiers' enlightenment:

> 'You . . . gentlemen of the souldiery in the field, though (not intending the ministry) for reasons best known to the State, you are forbidden to preach, as that in their judgment which belongs not to you; yet doubtless you may both pray and speake too in the head of your companies, regiments, and armies, you may deliver the piety of your souls, the well grounded confidence of your hearts, the valour of your minds, in such orations, in such liberties of speech, as may best enspirit the men that follow you with such a religious and undaunted animation as may render them unconquerable to the proudest enemy.'[3]

1. Ut per Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 318.
2. Journals of the House of Commons, (1644-1646) vol. III, p. 123. "April 25°, 1645."
3. "A Cleer and Just Vindication of the late-Ordinance, . . . from such malignant interpretaions, as some ill-affected labour to fasten on it," (1645), ut per Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 334.

However, Fairfax, preparing for the battle which was gathering at Naseby, had to decide on more urgent matters than whether the soldiers' preaching was "enspiriting the men . . . with such a religious and undaunted animation as may render them unconquerable" or whether it was plain gospel-preaching for the salvation of men's souls. Having no one to lead the cavalry into battle, Fairfax petitioned Parliament for Cromwell; when he rode into camp on June 13th with a troop of six hundred horse, Cromwell was welcomed with shouts of joy from the men; "'Ironsides,'" they cried, "'is come to head us.'"[1] Cromwell was indeed needed; the old soldiers of the king regarded the raw conscripts of the opposing army with contempt, and Charles was confident of defeating "the rebels new brutish general." Many of the supporters of the Parliament had their doubts about the untried army, but Cromwell was not among them. He later wrote:

> 'I can say this of Naseby: When I saw the enemy draw up and march in gallant order towards us, and we a company of poor, ignorant men, to seek how to order our battle—the General having commanded me to order all the horse—I could not, riding alone about my business, but smile out to God in praises, in assurance of victory, because God would, by things that are not, bring to naught things that are. Of which I had great assurance, and God did it.'[2]

With the name "Mary" (the king's favorite name for the queen) as their watchword, the royalists opened the attack by driving into the New Model infantry which Ireton's horse on the left sought to relieve but which was itself broken and pursued by Rupert. In the meantime, Cromwell to the right of the Parliamentary foot, had charged against Langdale and scattered his forces; observing the infantry's great difficulty, Cromwell charged into the left flank of the enemy's foot. Fairfax called in his

1. Firth, Cromwell, p. 126.
2. Ut per Firth, Cromwell, p. 127.

regiment of foot to assist the on-slaught, and the stubborn royalist infantry gave way. The king, reinforced by Rupert's return from his pursuit, rallied his horse for one last stand. The parliamentary forces regrouped and with their battle-cry "God with us" made ready for their charge—when Lord Carnwath suddenly took hold of the king's bridle and turned his horse round, crying out: "Will you go upon your death in an instant?" Seeing the king turning from the field, the royalist forces broke and fled, leaving thousands of wounded on the field. The Irish camp-followers were killed in cold blood, and all the king's supplies were taken.[1] In his letter, written the night of June 14, 1645, to the Speaker of the House, Cromwell described briefly the course of battle and attributed the victory to the hand of God; after praising the General for his bravery, he wrote of those men whose religion was still shocking to the Presbyterians who now controlled the Parliament:

> Honest men served you faithfully in this action. Sir, they are trusty; I beseech you, in the name of God, not to discourage them. I wish this action may beget thankfulness and humility in all that are concerned in it. He that ventures his life for the liberty of his country, I wish he trust God for the liberty of his conscience, and you for the liberty he fights for.[2]

Baillie, who had hoped it might have been the Scottish army that gave the decisive blow to the king's forces, wrote of the news of Naseby:

> We have a publick thanksgiving on Thursday. This accident is lyke to change much the face of affaires here. We hope the back of the malignant partie is broken. Some feares the insolence of others, to whom alone the Lord hes given the victory of that day. It wes never more necessare to haste up all possible recruits to our army: what next shall be done it is not yet certain. . . . we wish, from our heart, to see a happy end, and to be at home.[3]

1. Vide John Morley, Oliver Cromwell (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1900), 187-193 for details of this battle and its consequences.
2. Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, p. 192.
3. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 287.

Baillie was not alone in his concern over the "insolence" of those to whom God had given the victory; in search of some friends, Richard Baxter visited the army at Naseby and found it in such a religious state that he was made to fear "that England was lost by those that it had taken for its Chiefest Friends." Of this experience, he writes:

> We that lived quietly in Coventry did keep to our old Principles, and thought all others had done so too, except a very few inconsiderable Persons: We were unfeignedly for King and Parliament . . . And when the Court News-book told the World of the Swarms of Anabaptists in our Armies, we thought it had been a meer lye, because it was not so with us, nor in any of the Garrison or County-Forces about us. But when I came to the Army among Cromwell's Soldiers, I found a new face of things which I never dreamt of: I heard the plotting Heads very hot upon that which intimated their Intention to subvert both Church and State. Independency and Anabaptistry were prevalent: Antinomianism and Arminianism were equally distributed; and Thomas Moor's Followers (a Weaver of Wishitch and Lyn, of excellent Parts) had made some shifts to joyn these two Extreams together.
>
> Abundance of the common Troopers, and many of the officers, I found to be honest, sober, Orthodox Men, and others tractable ready to hear the Truth, and of upright Intentions: But a few proud, self-conceited, hot-headed Sectaries had got into the highest places, and were Cromwell's chief Favourites, and by their very heat and activity bore down the rest, or carried them along with them, and were the Soul of the Army, though much fewer in number than the rest (being indeed not one to twenty throughout the Army; their strength being in the Generals and Whalleys and Rich's Regiments of Horse, and in the new placed officers in many of the rest).[1]

From some "orthodox Captains of the Army" and from the mouths of "the leading Sectaries themselves," Baxter heard of such radical opinions as that the king was a tyrant and an enemy of the people, and the the Lords of England were but William the Conqueror's colonels; he found many who were especially bitter toward the "Sots" and all Presbyterian ministers whom they called "Priests and Priestbyters, and Drivimes, and the Dissemby-men, and such like." These, he writes,

> were far from thinking of a moderate Episcopacy, or of any healing way between the Episcopal and the Presbyterians: They most honoured

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, pp. 50-51.

> the Separatists, Anabaptists, and Antinomians; but Cromwell and his Council took on them to joyn themselves to no Party, but to be for the Liberty of all.[1]

For this condition, Baxter blames himself and his fellow ministers; he recalls that Cromwell's officers at the beginning of the war had purposed "to make their Troop a gathered Church" and had invited him to be their Pastor; he remembers that after Edgehill most of the ministers forsook the army and betook themselves to an easier and quieter way of life. While men like Peters, Dell and Saltmarsh who remained with the troops became great favorites, much disrespect was shown by the soldiers toward the clergy; Masson says

> those who belonged to it were spoken of as the Levites or priests by profession; the need for such a profession was voted obsolete; and any man was held to be as good for the preaching office as any other, if he had the preaching gift. And with the respect for ordination had vanished the respect for most of the regular Church-forms and symbols.[2]

Many of the soldiers fought under the conviction that they had been called of God to free the nation from the tyranny of man-made institutions, and as Dale says:

> It was not clear to them that Presbytery, with it hierarchy of courts, was very much better than Episcopacy. The Spirit of God, given to all that are 'in Christ,' was not to be fettered by 'Confessions,' 'Covenants,' and 'Directiories' of worship. Freedom must be left for the devout and adventurous soul to follow the guidance of the Spirit wherever the Spirit might lead.
>
> . . . From morning to night the camp was excited by theological debates. Officers and common soldiers held prayer-meetings and preached sermons every day of the week.[3]

This situation distressed Baxter; and because he "thought the Publick Good commanded" him, he volunteered to minister to the regiment of Captain Evanson, whom he described as "one of my orthodox Informers."[4]

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, pp. 50-51.
2. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, p. 523.
3. Dale, op. cit., pp. 306-307.
4. Reliquiae Baxterianae, p. 52.

However, news of Baxter's intentions proceeded his arrival in the Army; Cromwell "coldly" welcomed him and thereafter avoided him; Baxter was offended that he was never invited to the headquarters where "the Councils and Meetings of the officers were;" furthermore, Baxter reports "his Secretary gave out that there was a Reformer come to the Army to undeceive them, and to save Church and State, with some such other Jeers."[1] Disappointed and offended by this rebuff, Baxter, nevertheless, began his work; he writes:

> Here I set my self from day to day to find out the Corruptions of the Soldiers; and to discourse and dispute them out of their mistakes, both Religious and Political: My Life among them was a daily contending against Seducers, and gently arguing with the more Tractable, and another kind of Militia I had than theirs.[2]

Baxter informs us that there was much talk of Church Democracy; many were against forms of prayer and Infant-baptism; some argued against set times of prayer and "against the tying of our selves to any Duty before the Spirit move us;" others were for free-grace and free-will.

> . . . I was almost always, when I had opportunity, disputing with one or other of them; sometimes for our Civil Government, and sometimes for Church Order and Government; sometimes for Infant Baptism, and oft against Antinomianism and the contrary Extream. But their most frequent and vehement Disputes were for Liberty of Conscience, as they called it; that is, that the Civil Magistrate had nothing to do to determine of any thing in Matters of Religion, by constraint, or restraint, but every Man might not only <u>hold</u>, but <u>preach</u> and <u>do</u> in Matters of Religion what he pleased: That the Civil Magistrate hath nothing to do but with Civil Things, to keep the Peace, and protect the Churches Liberties, &c.[3]

Baxter says he found that the chief teachers of these ideas had been "hatcht up among the old Separatists, and had made it all the matter of their Study and Religion to rail against Ministers, and Parish Churches, and Presbyterians, and had little other knowledge."[4] Accompanying the

1. <u>Reliquiae Baxterianae</u>, p. 53.
2. <u>Ibid</u>.
3. <u>Ibid</u>.
4. <u>Ibid</u>.

army in pursuit of the remnants of the king's forces, Baxter noted the universal hatred which Goring's Army had incurred by its "incredible Prophaneness" and "unmerciful Plundering." During the fight at Bridgwater, he heard Major Harrison "break forth into the Praises of God with fluent Expressions, as if he had been in a Rapture." He records that Mr. Peters took the news of Goring's rout to the Commons and that all glory and applause went to the sectaries, with Cap. Evanson's part being slighted "because he was no Sectary."[1] Wherever the army went, Baxter says, the sectarian soldiers infected the country by their pamphlets and conversations; the people were ready to hear what the conquering army had to say, "and it was the way of the Faction to speak what they spake as the Sense of the Army." Baxter tried to correct this opinion; he writes,

> When we quarte's at Agmondesham in Buckinghamshire, some Sectaries of Chesham had set up a Publick Meeting as for Conference, to propagate their Opinions through all the Country; and this in the Church, by the encouragement of an ignorant Sectarian Lecturer, one Bramble, whom they had got in (while Dr. Cook the Pastor, and Mr. Richardson his Curate, durst not contradict them). When this publick Talking day came Bethel's Troopers (then Capt. Pitchford's) with other Sectarian Soldiers must be there, to confirm the Chesham Men, and make Men believe that the Army was for them: And I thought it my Duty to be there also and took divers sober Officers with me, to let them see that more of the Army were against them than for them. I took the Reading Pew, and Pitchford's Cornet and Troopers took the Gallery. And there I found a crowded Congreagtion of poor well-meaning People, that came in the Simplicity of their Hearts to be deceived. There did the Leader of the Chesham Men begin, and afterward Pitchford's Soldiers set in, and I alone disputed against them from Morning until almost Night; for I knew their trick, that if I had but gone out first, they would have parted what boasting words they lifted when I was gone, and made the People believe that they had baffled me, or got the best; therefore I stayed it out till they first rose and went away: The abundance of Nonsense which they uttered that day, may partly be seen in Mr. Edwards's Gangraena: for when I had wrote a Letter of it to a Friend in London, that and another were put into Mr. Edwards's Book, without my Name.[2]

Baxter called upon his fellow-ministers to assist him in combatting the

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, pp. 54-55.
2. Ibid., p. 56.

Sectarians; he told the ministers at Coventry "that the forsaking of the Army by the old Ministers, and the neglect of Supplying their Places by others, had undone us."[1] However, he was unsuccessful; only Mr. Cook came to help him, but he soon became "weary when he had not opportunity to preach, and weary of the Spirits he had to deal with," and left.[2] Baxter blames Cromwell for the rapid increase of the number and prestige of the sectarians; he says that by degrees Cromwell came to head "the greatest part of the Army with Anabaptists, Antinomians, Seekers, or Separatists at best: and all these he tied together by the point of Liberty of Conscience."[3] Baxter says that this cry of liberty of conscience was only a part of Cromwell's design for his own greatness;[4] with perhaps more fairness Gardiner says that the cause of religious liberty appealed to Cromwell on practical grounds: "How was he to fight the enemy, unless he could choose his officers for their military efficiency, and not for the Presbyterian opinions?"[5] Men of every variety of Protestant opinion had been called upon to serve their country, and in their contact with each other, they came to an agreement that "argument was to be met by argument alone." Gardiner says,

> Their iron discipline and their devotion to the cause permitted a freedom which would have been a mere dissolvent of armies enlisted after a more worldly system. As Cromwell stepped more pronouncedly to the front, his advocacy of religious liberty would become well-nigh irresistible.[6]

Cromwell concludes his account of the storming of Bristol (Sept. 14, 1645), with this paragraph:

> Presbyterians, Independents, all have here the same spirit of faith and prayer; the same presence and answer; they agree here,

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, p. 58.
2. Ibid., pp. 56-57.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., pp. 47-48.
5. Vide Gardiner, Cromwell, pp. 42-44.
6. Gardiner, Cromwell, pp. 43-44.

> have no names of difference: pity it is it should be otherwise anywhere! All that believe, have the real unity, which is most glorious; because inward, and spiritual, in the Body, and to the Head. For being united in forms, commonly called Uniformity, every Christian will for peace-sake study and do, as far as conscience will permit. And for brethren, in things of the mind we look for no compulsion, but that of light and reason.[1]

The fall of Bristol was a great blow to the king. After Naseby, Rupert had advised the king to surrender; Charles had replied that as he could not believe that God would suffer "rebels and traitors to prosper" he would not "give over this quarrel;" then, after promising to hold Bristol for four months, Rupert suddenly capitualted, which to the king savored of disloyalty and treason.[2] Suspicions and quarrels among the king's forces increased as fortress after fortress crumbled under the parliamentary attacks—Winchester, Basing House, Exeter—until nothing was left; Charles fled north and surrendered himself to the Scots at Newark June 6, 1646. The war was over, but peace did not come; Rushworth tells that after the fight of Stow-in-the-Wold old Jacob Astley sat on a drum, his white hair blowing in the wind and said to his conquerors: "'You have now done your work, and you may go play, unless you fall out amongst yourselves.'"[3] The arbitrary power of the king was broken, and that work was to remain as the beginning of English democracy; the establishment of religious liberty which the army sought to include in its work was not so easily accomplished; in fact it was over that issue that the victors fell out among themselves, spoiling their "play" and giving Charles another chance.

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, pp. 205-206.
2. Vide Morley Cromwell, pp. 195-196.
3. Ut per John Buchan, Oliver Cromwell (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1937), 229.

CHAPTER SIX

THE DEBATE ON TOLERATION OF LAY-PREACHING (1644-1648)

I. THE QUESTION OF TOLERATION
   A. The issue of lay-preaching
   B. "Liberty of Conscience"
   C. Owen's Duty of Pastors and People

II. THE PRESBYTERIAN OPPOSITION
   A. Daniel Featley
   B. Ephraim Pagitt
   C. William Prynne
   D. Robert Baillie (A Dissvasive)
   E. Thomas Edwards
   F. Robert Baillie (Anabaptism)
   G. Samuel Kem

III. THE STRUGGLE RENEWED OVER TOLERATION
   A. The king's bargaining
   B. The Presbyterian majority in Commons
   C. The army's challenge
   D. The Second Civil War
   E. The execution of the king

IV. CLASH OF PENS
   A. Independent views
   B. Liberal churchmen
   C. Satire and slander
   D. Anti-clerical writings

V. THE DEBATE: PRO AND CON
   A. Lt. Edmund Chillenden
   B. Lazarus Seaman
   C. Benjamin Woodbridge
   D. John Knowles

The issue between Presbyterianism and Independency had been set forth long before the war ended; this issue was summed up in one word, toleration, which to the Presbyterians meant the undoing of "their reformation" and to the Independents the fulfillment of their hopes and expectations. While our primary concern in this thesis does not lie in the struggle of these two parties over this issue, we must note that the question of lay-preaching was involved in it. As we have noted, the Presbyterians denounced toleration as a door to "Anabaptisme," wherein every cobbler, tinker and weaver could preach; on the other hand, the Independents, with variations, defended the prophesying or preaching of private men as warranted by Scripture. One of the first usage of the term, lay-preaching, appeared in 1642 in the title of a pamphlet by John Bewick, An Antidote Against Lay-Preaching. Stating that preaching is a peculiar calling, distinct from all others, Bewick argues that no one should undertake it until he is called, for "God disapproves, yea detests, and complaines against such, who undertake preaching without a call."[1] He who is "called according to Gods own appointment, must bee separated or set apart by the Church Governours . . . to give himselfe wholy to teach;" men of other professions, although endowed with spiritual gifts, ought not to undertake preaching, because (1) every man is bound to abide in his own calling and (2) the Holy Writ affords no precedent of any who did so.[2] In 1644 "A Well-willer to Reformation" published Lay-Preaching unmasked. or a Discourse Tending to shew the

1. John Bewick, An Antidote Against Lay-Preaching, . . . (13 lines), (London: for Andrew Crook), 1642, p. 9.
2. Ibid., pp. 16, 18-21.

unlawfulness of Lay-mens preaching in Publique or Private. Not condemning "the holy oppositions" which sincere ministers manifest against the corruptions of the times, "Well-willer" declares that he speaks only against

> that blinde zeale that wants both knowledge and truth, for direction, and runns either upon conjectures, or evill Enthusiasmes . . . that hath its originall and breeding from a distempered braine, and at length produces many exorbitant and giddy deviations from the sobriety and analogy of true Religion, as a Learned Divine speakes, this is that zeale which requires just censure and sound conviction.[1]

Answering the argument that we do not read of private gifts or private Christians in the Scriptures, "Well-willer" says that Christ designed some Christians for particular places (Acts 6:1-2) and endowed them with a spiritual sufficency to perform the duties of those places. God has set down in Scripture certain offices, some of which are extraordinary, while others are ordinary which "succeed perpetually in the Church;" therefore, the least of Christians cannot take a public office upon himself, "unlesse in case of necessitie." While Christians ought to edify each other in those graces which God gives them, they ought not to assume the responsibilities of office, for such would tend "the high way to Anabaptisme."[2] In the Scriptures none preached except those in office or upon extraordinary occasions or in cases of necessity; the preaching of the dispersed Christians at the time of persecution was extraordinary, as were the cases of the Samaritan woman and the healed man. Moses only wished that all the people might have "a spirit of Government, which those Elders were to share in with Moses."[3] The prophecy of Joel only

1. A Well-willer to Reformation, Lay-Preaching Unmasked, . . . (11 lines), (London: for W. L.), 1644, "To the Reader".
2. Ibid., pp. 1-6.
3. Ibid., p. 14.

means that God will pour out His Spirit so that all will profess His Name and will walk according to those dictates of His Spirit; "the last times" extend from the Apostles' time down through ours, as there are yet many signs to come.[1] Rebuking his opponent (Spencer) for arguing as if all prophesy were preaching and for saying that all of God's people could be public preachers, "Well-willer" says:

> . . . I wonder a man should be so miserably mistaken, as to expose himselfe to the publike censures of learned Divines, who cry out in their Pulpits against such impertinent allegations, certainly if wee had but the Presbyteriall discipline established in the church you would goe neare to come under the scourge of Ecclesiasticall censure, for broaching such detestable opinions, although you never practised them, because herein you open wide the mouthes of the Anabaptists.[2]

In July of 1644 John Knowles challenged Giles Workman, in the presence of Major General Massie, to answer why lay-men should not preach; although Knowles was not regarded as "a meet Antagonist in this controversie," Workman later undertook, in Private-men no Pulpit-men, to give him "a taste how little is said for it, how much be said against it."[3] Although both Knowles and Workman had rejected "the Papists distinction of Clergie and Laity," Knowles used the term lay-man as one of the people in contrast to the ministry, and Workman accepts this usage of lay-man, "a private man, or a man not in office, a man not a Preacher by office." Granting that no man may preach unless he has the command of God, Knowles cited Rom. 12:6, Acts 8:1, and I Cor. 14 as commands to "'all that have the gift of prophesie to use it;'" to which Workman replies that it would then follow that all who have the ability to baptize or to rule

1. A Well-willer, Lay-Preaching Unmasked, p. 20.
2. Ibid., p. 21.
3. Giles Workman, Private-men no Pulpit-men: or, a Modest Examination of Lay-Mens Preaching, . . . (10 lines), (London: printed by F. Neile,) 1646, "To the Reader."

may do so. The word Gift is used for the office itself or "gifted calling" (Eph. 3:8, 4:8-11); abilities are "but the foundation of a calling" and do not, of themselves, warrant the authority to preach (John 20:21). Preaching is "the first and principal act of the Key of Authority," and if it may be done "promiscuously by any," then the minister's office is needless. Prophets were set in the Corinth Church (I Cor. 12:29) as officers; "you have as good warrant to say there were Lay-Apostles, Lay-Teachers, Lay-Governors, who were gifted men not in office, as you have to say there were Lay-Prophets, or Prophets not in office."[1] The extraordinary office of prophecy was temporary and now has ceased, or else men now could speak with tongues and work miracles. Those who really possess gifts fit for the ministry (often they are only pretended ones, I Tim. 1:7), should desire the office and therein exercise them (I Tim. 3:1). "This is Christs order, to be called to the office of the Ministry, then preach: they that do not this, do (for ought I know) cross Christs order, preach unwarrantably, and walk disorderly in this particular."[2] Thomas Whitefield's A Refutation of the Loose Opinions, and Licentious Tenets wherewith those Lay-preachers which wander up and downe the Kingdome, labour to seduce the simple People, (1646), is mainly directed against the teachings of Thomas More, formerly a weaver in Wells near Wisbich but now a teacher of "the universality of Gods Free Grace in Christ to Mankinde," which teaching Whitefield seeks to refute.[3]

1. Workman, Private-men no Pulpit-men, p. 6.
2. Ibid., p. 8.
3. Thomas Whitefield, A Refutation of the Loose Opinions, and Licentious Tenets, . . . (12 lines), (London: for John Bellamie), 1646.

While some were stating the question of toleration in terms of the promiscuous preaching of cobblers, tinkers and such, others were defending it in the larger terms of the individual's right to worship God after the dictates of his own conscience. In March 1644, there appeared an anonymous tract, The Liberty of Conscience, or the sole means to obtain peace and truth, which attributed all the troubles and wars of that day to "'the general obstinacy and averseness of most men . . . to tolerate and bear with tender consciences and different opinions.'"[1] Barring only the Catholics, the author pleads for a general freedom of worship, and says that several congregations of freely assembled people would be less dangerous to the State and more acceptable to God than one enforced assembly in a parish church. We are told that the little profit of outward conformity is shown by the enforced subscription of the covenant and that the greatest part of the people are "'little weaned from the present service-book, and wish better to Episcopacy a little reformed, rather than Presbyterial or any other church government whatsover.'"[2] It is admitted that if liberty be granted, false teachers will appear, but "'it were better that many false doctrines were published . . . than that one sound truth should be forcibly smothered or wilfully concealed.'"[3] In July of 1644, the American Apostle of religious freedom, Roger Williams, published The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for cause of Conscience, in which the doctrine of absolute religious freedom is boldly and passionately evolved. Williams declares that it is the duty of the magistrate to preserve the bodies of his subjects and not

1. Ut per Gardiner, Civil War, vol. I, p. 290.
2. Ibid., pp. 291-292.
3. Ibid.

to destroy them for conscience's sake; "'the civil sword may make a nation of hypocrites . . ., but not one Christian.'" The magistrate owes protection even to false worshippers; "'Christ's lilies may flourish in his Church, notwithstanding the abundance of weeds in the world permitted.'"[1] In the same year (1644), there appeared another pamphlet advocating religious liberty, bearing the simple title, M. S. to A. S.; Baillie identifies its author as John Goodwin of Coleman Street, who was "openly for a full liberty of conscience to all sects, even Turks, Jews, Papists."[2] While all sects and schisms were to be tolerated, the author says they were to be reasoned with by the ministers and disciplined within their own church.[3]

In The duty of Pastors and People distinguished (1644), John Owen endeavors to show that "the sacred calling may retaine its ancient dignity, though the people of God be not deprived of their Christian liberty."[4] Before the giving of the law, everyone served God according to the knowledge he had of His Will; with the coming of the law the offering of sacrifices was restricted to the tribe of Levi, but the law of Moses did not destroy "the law of nature" which made a duty of "paternall teaching and instruction of families in things which appertaine to God." While the people of God were enjoined to read the Scriptures, to talk of them and to communicate their knowledge of them unto others, the solemn public teaching and instructing of others "was committed unto those who, in regard of ordinary performance, were set apart by GOD."[5] The old

1. Ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 118-119.
2. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, pp. 180-181.
3. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 120-122.
4. John Owen, The duty of Pastors and People distinguished, . . . (15 lines), (London: by L. N.), 1644, p. 10.
5. Ibid., p. 17.

ritual priesthood which belonged to the tribe of Levi is "swallowed up in the Priesthood of Christ" so that now what distinguishes the ministers of the gospel from the people of God "seemes to be a more immediate participation of Christs Propheticall office, to teach, instruct and declare the Will of God unto men, and not of his sacredotall, to offer sacrifices for men unto God."[1] In extraordinary cases men who have no outward calling to preach may receive a warrant to do so by an immediate call from God, which they may know (1) in an immediate revelation, or (2) in a concurrence of Scripture rules, directory for such occasions, or (3) in some outward acts of providence necessitating them thereunto. Should a universal darkness spread over the face of the church and God should reveal something, heretofore unknown or generally disbelieved, to "a meere lay man," that man should preach, or else he would be hiding his light under a bushel to the damnation of men's souls; so Owen deems all the "curious disquisition after the outward vocation of our first reformers, Luther, Calvin, &c" as altogether needless.[2] Likewise if a Christian man should be shipwrecked upon the country of some barbarous people who had never heard of Christ he may and ought to preach Christ unto them.

> None I hope makes any doubt of it; and in the Primitive times, nothing was more frequent then such examples; thus were the Indians and the Moores turned to faith, as you may see in Eusebius: yea, great was the liberty which in the first Church was used in this kinde, presently after the supernaturall gift of tongues ceased amongst men.[3]

As God has revealed "his minde concerning his worship and our salvation" we cannot expect any such as Moses, the prophets or the apostles, but we

1. Owen, The duty of Pastors and People distinguished, pp. 25-26.
2. Ibid., 40-41.
3. Ibid.

can expect those who are called to the work of restoration and reformation. God does not always supply his messengers with the gift of miracles, for we read of no miracles wrought by the prophet Amos who surely was extraordinarily and immediately called; "it sufficeth then that they be furnished with a supernatural power either in, 1. Discerning, 2. Speaking, 3. Working."[1] Such men are not

> to expect any ordinary vocation, from men below, God calling them aside to his worke, from the middest of their Brethren: The Lord of the harvest may send labourers into his field, without asking his Stewards consent, and they shall speake what ever he saith unto them.[2]

Declaring himself for the Presbyterial or Synodical church government in opposition to the Prelatical or Diocesan and to the Independent or Congregational, Owen sets forth the following duties of private Christians, living in an orthodox and well ordered church: (1) A diligent searching of the Scriptures, with fervent prayers to Almighty God, (2) an examination and trial of the doctrine that is publicly taught unto them, pinning their faith not upon men's opinions, but using the Bible as the touchstone of all doctrines, (3) the fulfillment of their Christian duties toward each other, to warn the unruly (I Thes. 5:14), to admonish offending brethren (Matt. 18:15), to instruct the ignorant (John 4:29) etc. Two things are required in a public, formal, ministerial teacher: gifts from God and authority from the church; in ordinary cases both are essential. There are two sorts of gifts: "one of a private alley, looking primarily inwards; the other, ayming at the common wealth or profit of the whole church." Christians may assemble to improve their knowledge and to increase Christian charity; but "because there be many Uzzahs amongst us,

1. Owen, The duty of Pastors and People distinguished, pp. 34-35.
2. Ibid., pp. 36-37.

who have an itching desire to be fingring of the Arke, . . . and like the ambitious sons of Levi, taking too much upon them," Owen cautions that under a pretence of Christian liberty and freedom of conscience, they do not cast away all brotherly amity and cut themselves off from the communion of the church.[1] Owen recognizes the warrant of Christians assembling in private (Matt. 18:19-20):

> The thing itselfe, rightly understood, can scarce be condemned of any, who envies not the salvation of soules. They that would banish the Gospell from our houses, would not much care, if it were gone from our hearts. . . . Must a master of a family cease praying in his family, and instructing his children and servants in the wayes of the Lord, for fear of being counted a Preacher in a Tub?[2]

As we have noted, many royalists sought to discredit the parliamentarians by identifying them with the "tub-preachers," whom they unmercifully slandered and satirized; some of the Presbyterians adopted the same tactics in an effort to discredit the Independents;[3] in fact, some of the royalists helped them in ridiculing the "mechanick-preachers." While imprisoned as "a spy and intelligencer" Daniel Featley wrote The Dippers dipt (1645), which he dedicated to Parliament in "a desperate bid for liberty."[4] Describing the "Anabaptists" as the worst of the heretics, who "defile our Rivers with their impure washings, and our Pulpits with their false prophecies and phanaticall enthusiasmes,"[5] Featley says that God had judged against such "a lying and blasphemous Sect" by inflicting fearful judgments upon their leaders.[6] To their claim that

1. Owen, The duty of Pastors and People distinguished, pp. 47-48.
2. Ibid., p. 53.
3. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 129-130.
4. "Daniel Featley," Dictionary of National Biography, vol. XVIII, p. 278.
5. Daniel Featley, The Dippers dipt. or, The Anabaptists Dvck'd and Plvng'd Head and Eares, . . . (14 lines), (4th ed., London: for Nicholas Brown), 1646, "Epistle Dedicatory," p. 3.
6. Ibid., pp. 115-135.

"there ought to be no distinction by the word of God, betweene the Clergie and Laity, but that all who are gifted may preach the Word, and administer the Sacraments," Featley replies that God has severed the clergy from the laity in both the Old and New Testaments (Num. 18:20, Matt. 28:19) and that the Scriptures relate severe punishments inflicted upon lay-persons for usurping the priests function (Num. 16:31, II Sam. 6:7). Those who endeavor to execute the office of a priest or minister ought to have a calling thereunto (Heb. 5:4), which "Lay persons, whether Merchants or Artizans, or Husbandmen, or any the like," do not have. A "dispenser of the mysteries of salvation" must have an inward call which enables him and an outward call which authorizes him to discharge his sacred function. The Anabaptists have neither, for although they can "vary phrases, and out of broken Notes hold out a discourse upon some passages of Scripture for an houre and more," they do not understand the original languages, nor use rhetoric, logic or philosophy; "neither may they fly to immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and the miraculous gifts of Tongues and Prophesie, for such have ceased in the Church for these many hundred years."[1] The prophecy of Joel 2:28 has been fulfilled at Pentecost, and now a great measure of knowledge is given, through the pastors, to the people. The examples of Eldad and Medad, of Saul and Amos, of Peter and Paul are extraordinary, and in no way warrant tradesmen to take upon themselves to preach; they proved their calling by wonders and signs which if "our new Enthusiasts and Brownists" can do "we will not deny them the exercise of the ministeriall function."[2]

1. Featley, The Dippers dipt, pp. 84-85.
2. Ibid., pp. 85-86.

Ephraim Pagitt, a royalist minister who came to favor Presbyterianism as a "preferable alternative to independency,"[1] is the author of Heresiography (1645), which is so similar to Featley's Dippers dipt that it is not to be wondered that his enemies asserted "Doctor Featlies Devill to be transmigrated into old Ephraim Pagit."[2] In his dedicatory epistle, Pagitt urges the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London to fight "the plague of haeresie," of which the greatest danger he attributes to the Anabaptists; in reciting the extravagances and enormities attributed to the German Anabaptists, he, according to Masson, tries "to involve the English Baptists in the odium of such an original."[3] He lists fourteen "sorts of Anabaptists," such as: the Silentes who "answer all questions of Religion with much silence," the Enthusiasts who "pretend that they have the gift of Prophesie by dreams," the Liberi who "think themselves freed from paying any rent, tribute, or tiths," the Adamites who "think cloaths to be cursed and . . . themselves to be without sin."[4] We are told that the Brownists teachers come "from mechanick trades, and set them downe in Moses chaire;" we are told that the Independents who were beginning to call their church-polity "The Congregationall government,"[5] refer to churches as "steeple-houses," oppose learning and the payment of tithes, and that they permit "any man whom they take to bee gifted, publikely to expound and apply Scripture, to pray and to blesse the people."[6] The Familists "blasphemously pretend to be godified like

1. "Ephraim Pagitt," Dictionary of National Biography, vol. XLIII.
2. E. Pagitt, Heresiography, or a description of the Hereticks and Sectaries of these Latter times (4th ed., London: by W. L.), 1647, "Postscript," p. 160.
3. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, p. 138.
4. Pagitt, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
5. Ibid., pp. 82-83.
6. Ibid., pp. 87-88.

God, whereas indeed they are devillified like their Father the Devill;" the Antinomians teach that a man needs only to discern that Christ is his and thereafter needs do nothing "unlesse mooved by the Spirit;" the Arminians believe that the Will of God is "to save such as shall believe and persevere in faith and obedience." The Socinians teach that Christ "dyed not to satisfie for our sins," and the Millenaries "looke for a temporary Kingdome of Christ, that must begin presently, and last 1000. years;" the Sabbatarians affirm that the old Jewish Sabbath is to be kept, while the Antisabbatarians would make every day a Sabbath. The Soul-Sleepers teach that a soul sleeps from death unto Judgment Day; the Antiscriptarians deny the Scriptures, and the Seekers deny all ministry and ordinances and seek for the church "in the wilderness." The Hetheringtonians follow a boxmaker who "cast off his Trade, and betook himselfe to bee an Interpreter of the Scriptures to many persons, keeping private Conventicles."[1] Since the suspension of "our Church government," Pagitt says,

> every one that listeth turneth Preacher, as Shoo-makers, Coblers, Button-makers, Hostlers, & such like, take upon them to expound the holy Scriptures, intrude into our Pulpits, and vent strange doctrine, tending to faction, sedition, and blasphemy.[2]

In July of 1645 William Prynne added to his numerous publications, A Fresh Discovery of some Prodigious New Wandring-Blasing-Stars & Firebrands, in which, according to Masson, he exhibited all the monstrous things he could find against Independency in an effort "to shock the public and rouse Parliament to action."[3] In rebuking the members of Parliament for tolerating such fire-brands as would destroy the nation,

1. Pagitt, op. cit., pp. 129-133.
2. Ibid., "Epistle Dedicatory," p. 4.
3. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 140-141.

Prynne cites the contempt shown to the order against laymen's preaching:

> Quoth the Scotchman, 'Man, is it fit that Colonel Cromwell's souldiers should preach in their quarters to take away the ministers' function?'
>
> Quoth the Englishman, 'Truly I remember they made a gallant sermon at Marston Moor near York. That was one of the best sermons that hath been preached in the kingdom.'[1]

Prynne tells of "two preaching Captaines of the Schismaticall Confederacy" who when arrested by Sir Samuel Luke's officers at Newport-Pannell for preaching in contempt of the ordinance (April 26, 1645), said that the General and all the Colonels in the army were "deeply engaged in their Designe" and that they would acquaint their friends in the House of Commons of their bad usage. When Luke's officers replied that they had a commission from Parliament for what they did, the preaching Captains said, "That if the godly and wel-affected party was thus persecuted, they should be forced to make a worse breach then what was yet, when they had done with the kings party. . . ."[2] Referring to the numerous speeches, letters, covenants which he presents, in proof of "a strong conspiracy among some Anabaptisticall Sectaries," Prynne asks:

> is it not . . . high time for your Honours, with all other well-affected Persons to look about you? to Vindicate your own Power, Honour, Justice, against these most seditious, audatious, contemptuous Libellers against your Soveraign Authority, your most Religious ordinances, proceedings in the desired waies of Reformation; and to make some of them Exemplary Monuments of your Impartiall severity, to deter others from the like unparalleled Insolencies, not read nor heard of in any preceding Age, nor practised by any Generation of men, but these New furious Sectaries: who to engage all sorts of people in their Quarrell, proclaim a free Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, to all Sects, all Religions whatsoever, be it Judaisme,

1. W. Prynne, A Fresh Discovery of some Prodigious New Wandring-Blasing-Stars & Firebrands, . . . (26 lines), (London: by John Macock), 1645.

2. Ibid., "Epistle Dedicatory." Firth says that Fairfax was not inclined to lose the service of two useful officers in the middle of a campaign, and obliged Luke at once to release them (Hobson and Beaumont). Vide Firth, Cromwell's Army, pp. 335-336.

> Paganisme, Turcisme, Arianisme, Popery; (as all their Pamphlets manifest) and to interest the female Sex, and draw them to their party, they (contrary to the Apostles precept) allow them not only decisive Votes, but Liberty of Preaching, Prophesying, speaking in their Congregations; yea, power to meet in their Nocturnall Conventicles, without their Husbands, Parents, Ministers Privitie, the better to propagate Christs Kingdome, and multiply the Godly party: which what confusion and Atazy it will soon produce in Church and State, if not prevented by your Honours extraordinary speedy Diligence, Wisdome, Power, I humbly submit to your deepest Judgement.[1]

In A Dissvasive from the Errours of the Time (1645), Robert Baillie declares that all the sects which now blaspheme the Reformation "were bred and born under the wings of no other Dame then Episcopacy" and that only by setting up "the government of Christ . . . as it is in the rest of the Reformed Churches" could England be cured of the great evil of heresies and schisms which "now not only troubles the Peace and welfare, but hazards the very subsistence both of Church and Kingdom."[2] Describing the Independents as off-springs of "that great root," Brownism, he writes:

> about Prophesying after Sermon, they are at a full agreement, permitting to any private man of the flock, or to any stranger whom they take to be gifted, publickely to expound and apply the Scripture, to pray, and to blesse the people. They permit two or three of these, after the end of the Sermon, to exercise their gifts.
>
> When the exercise of the Prophets is ended, they use another ordinance of questioning the Preachers and Prophets by any member of the congregation, about any point of the Doctrine.[3]

They also "hold a doore open for themselves to preach in the Parish-churches . . . as gifted men and Prophets, for the conversion of those who are to be made members of their new Congregation."[4] The Reformed Churches give all liberty to every Christian to edify one another privately and to the "sons of the Prophets" to train themselves for the pastoral

1. Prynne, A Fresh Discovery, p. 6.
2. Robert Baylie, A Dissvasive from the Errours of the Time . . . (10 lines), (London: printed for Samuel Gellibrand), 1646, "Preface," pp. 7-8.
3. Ibid., p. 118.
4. Ibid., pp. 174-175.

charge, but they give the power of public preaching only to pastors and doctors who are called by God and the Church. In defence of this tenet that none but ministers may ordinarily prophesy or preach, Baillie gives the following arguments: (1) Christ joined together the powers of baptism and the power of preaching (Matt. 28:19); (2) those who preach, must be sent to that work (I Cor. 1:17, Rom. 10:15); (3) every ordinary preacher labors in the Word and Doctrine, whereby they are distinguished from the ruling elder, (I Tim. 5:17); (4) none out of office have the gift of preaching; for all who have that gift are either apostles, evangelists, prophets, pastors or doctors, and all these are officers (Ephes. 4:8); (5) no man out of office might sacrifice; therefore, it is unlawful for men out of office to preach (Heb. 5:3-5); (6) all who have the gift of preaching are obliged to lay aside all other occupations and attend that work alone (I Tim. 4:13-15); (7) the Apostles appointed none to preach but elders (Titus 1:5); (8) the preaching of men out of office is a means of confusion and error.[1]

The most violent of these anti-toleration pamphlets was Thomas Edwards' Gangraena (1646) which produced such a sensation that a second edition was called for immediately and within the year Edwards added a Second and a Third Part. The first part enumerates sixteen sorts of sectaries, one hundred and eighty errors or heresies and twenty-eight alleged malpractices; it concludes with "an outcry against toleration which well nigh exhausted the language of abuse."[2] The Second Part catalogues thirty-four "fresh" errors not previously mentioned and quotes

1. Baylie, A Dissvasive from the Errours, pp. 175-177.
2. "Thomas Edwards," Dictionary of National Biography, vol. XVII, p. 128.

other charges against the Independents from the letters of Presbyterian ministers throughout the country; the Third Part reveals further errors and heresies. Masson describes the Three Parts of Gangraena as "a curious Presbyterian repertory of facts and scandals respecting the English Independents and Sectaries in and shortly after the year of Marston Moor."[1] The Dictionary of National Biography makes this evaluation:

> Any controversial value which Edwards's work might possess is almost entirely set at nought by the unrestrained virulence of his language, and the intemperate fury with which he attacked all whose theological opinions differed, however slightly, from his own. He did not hesitate to make outrageous charges on the personal character of his opponents, and throughout his manner is far more maledictory than argumentative.[2]

In his dedication, Edwards describes swarms of "all sorts of illiterate mechanick Preachers, yea of Women and Lay Preachers" who go up and down the country committing insolencies and outrages and causing tumults and riots. Among the errors he lists are these:

> 123. No man hath more to do to preach the Gospel then another, but every man may preach the Gospel, as well as any.
> 124. That 'tis lawfull for women to preach, and why should they not, having gifts as well as men? and some of them do actually preach, having great resort to them.[3]

Edwards charges that the Sectaries keep many churches without ministers so that they may have "the liberty of the Pulpits for all kind . . . of mechanick preachers, who come from London, the Armies, and other places to preach in and corrupt the people;"[4] he notes that

> upon all motions and petitions for setling the Government, or against Toleration, the Army is spoken of: And will you discourage those that fight so bravely, and that God hath made so instrumentall

1. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, p. 142.
2. "Thomas Edwards," D. N. B., vol. XVII, p. 128.
3. Thomas Edwards, The First and Second Part of Gangraena: or a Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time, . . . (7 lines), (3rd ed., corrected and much Enlarged, London: by T. R. and E. M.), 1646, p. 26.
4. Ibid., p. 56.

> to you? and that if they may not have libertie of conscience, and libertie to preach, the Army will be discouraged, and if they may not preach they will not fight; and after victories we have been minded by Letters from the Army of libertie of conscience, and expecting no compulsion in matters of mind.[1]

Many former soldiers had become preachers: John Hich was preaching at markets, fairs and private meetings at Hauridge, and one Marshal, a young bricklayer at Hackney, was teaching that it is unlawful to fight or to kill any man. Paul Hobson, formerly a tailor of Buckinghamshire, was now a captain in the army and preached wherever he could get a pulpit or an audience.[2] Henry Denne, formerly "a high-altar man," had turned Anabaptist and invited any layman to "exercise after him;" Clement Wrighter who "fell off from the Communion of our Churches" about seven years ago is described as "an arch-heretique and fearful Apostate, an old Wolf, and a subtile man, who goes about corrupting and venting his Errors."[3] Edwards speaks of Kiffin as "a great active Anabaptist" and refers to Knowles as "one of them who dares keep publick Disputations . . . with Ministers of the City;" Peters is described as "the Soliciter General for the Sectaries" who must be consulted in the army about "any great designe or business" of the Sectaries.[4] Reference is made to one Oates, a weaver in London, who was drawing great flocks of people after him and who was rebuking them for going to "the steeple houses" to hear their "Popish priests."[5] Edwards informs us of some women preachers, the most famous of whom was Mrs. Attaway, a lace-maker of Bell-Alley in Coleman Street, who had left her unsanctified husband and her helpless children to go to Jerusalem with a prophet, named William Jenny who had put away his wife as "a disturber of

1. Edwards, The First and Second Part of Gangraena, pp. 64-65.
2. Ibid., pp. 20-25.
3. Ibid., pp. 26-27.
4. Ibid., pp. 27, 37-42 passim.
5. Ibid., p. 113.

body and soul."[1]

Baillie's Anabaptism, The Trve Fovntaine of Independency, Brownisme, Antinomy, Familisme (1646) is superior in many ways to the work of either "the senile Paget, or the fluent and credulous Edwards,"[2] but it expresses the same opposition to toleration; in his dedicatory epistle, he says:

> . . . when we have returned Victors from that field, behold our more perillous exercises are but yet approaching. The Sectaries of more names and kindes then ever were known in any Kingdome of the world, tell us with open mouth, we must be their slaves: They must have liberty to overthrow our Parliaments; all Kings, all Lords, and this House of Commons; to set up the individuals, as they love to speak, of the whole multitude, in the Throne of absolute Soveraignty. From this new Soveraign we are commanded to expect a body of new Laws, a modell of a new Ochlocratorick government. This yoak, much worse then a Turkish slavery, must be put upon our body, but a worse upon our soul: A full liberty must be granted to ever Seducer, who will in the most publick places, & within the doors of our houses also, perswade our loving consorts, our dear children, our faithfull servants & friends, to deny Christ, to embrace Mahomets Alcoran, the Jewish Talmud, the fables of the Pagan Poets, in place of the Old and New Testament, for the everlasting destruction of their souls. This is the reward which the Sectaries plead for, as due to their labors in the war against the comon Enemy.[3]

Having hindered the Reformation, the sectarians now proceed to overthrow the State, which can only be prevented by a reconciliation of the king upon equitable and just terms, "the reduction of his minde to our sense;" in the meantime, Baillie calls upon "all whom God has called to any employment in his house" to give loud warnings of the dangers about them.[4] To show that "the same very spirit . . . breath this day in the Anabaptists of Britain, which inspired their Fathers of former times in Germany," Baillie reviews the faith and practices of the German Anabaptists; of the

1. Edwards, The First and Second Part of Gangraena, pp. 113-115.
2. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 142-143.
3. Robert Baillie, Anabaptism, the Trve Fovntaine of Independency, Antinomy, Brownisme, Familisme . . . (17 lines), (London: Printed by M. F.), 1647, "Epistle Dedicatory."
4. Ibid., "Preface."

modern Anabaptists in England, he says that as they are "a people very zealous of Liberty, and most unwilling to be under the bondage of the judgement of any other," it is hard "to fasten any tenets upon them more then they please to accept;" however, he classifies their beliefs under three heads: "first, rigid Brownism; secondly,Antipaedobaptism; thirdly, Arminianism, Antinomianism, Arianism, Familism, and other grosse heresies towards which too many of them are now declined."[1] The independent jurisdiction of each church is placed in the whole multitude of its members; "with the power of censure they joyn the power of preaching, all their members who finde themselves gifted are permitted to prophecy in the face of the Congregation."[2]

Major Samuel Kem's sermon Orders given Out; the Word, Stand Fast, which was delivered as a farewell message to the officers and soldiers of his regiment in Bristol, November 8, 1646, is quite notable in that the speaker is of Presbyterian sympathies. Regretting to leave his regiment, the major says he desires to leave "such orders . . . as may secure you for Gods glory and your mutual comforts" and so speaks on the text, "Stand fast in the Faith: quit you like men: Be strong. Let all things be done in love." (I Cor. 16:13-14).

> The Alarum beats Christian soldiers, to your arms; take heed (as the case stands) of facing about, but as you were; to your ground of Scripture foundations, and so stand fast in the faith. And although reducable, in regard of human Actings, yet never in this life must you expect a discharge from spiritual millitary undertakings, for when you were listed in Jesus Christ muster-role it was not for a day lesse or more then your life; and therefore I beseech you stand fast.[3]

1. Baillie, Anabaptism, The Trve Fovntaine, pp. 48-49.
2. Ibid., p. 52.
3. Major Samuel Kem, Orders given out; the word, Stand Fast, . . . (11 lines), (London: Printed by I. M.), 1647, p. 1.

Describing the forces arrayed against them as under the command of "the grand General" (the devil) and naming the main body of those forces as "sinful flesh," the major entreats his hearers to strengthen themselves by recruiting three divisions: fidelity or constancy, spiritual gallantry and unity. There are "humane moral Truthes, rules in secular Arts" (which we should use but not abuse or glory in them) and there are "Divine truths."

> I do not say it is gallantry to stand fast to all that every man delivers to you for truth, or propounds, or conjectures to bee so, but such as Scripture determines to be so; such as the word wil own, and wil own the word upon demand, in the evidence of his, not our own spirits. . . .[1]

Get a solid sound judgement "by the light of a clear and sanctified understanding of Scripture principles" and labor to have "a stubborn and stout wil" in relation to truth, standing to it in profession and in practise.

> The ancient Disciples left ships, nets, custome-house, far to follow truth; but now professed Disciples leave Christ for places of Excise and Custom-house. Some turn sneaking Anabaptists; some fal off to Socinian blasphemies; some to Antinomians fancies; and many Seekers. . . . It is a sad time, but this is a more sad omen of worser times, even the rabble of opinions in this City of Bristol; of which I may say, that as the sword hath slain many, so hath error many more in a few moneths time. . . . Men easily grow erroneous when they affect Liberty, and wax Irreligious. . . . Men are strangely infected with a base and late predominant Epidemical disease the Itch of spiritual Pride. . . .[2]

Reminding his hearers that they may discover Truth by its Unity its Purity, its Efficacy, its Antiquity and its Simplicity, the major concludes his sermon by begging "heartily of you, yea (more then for my Arrears) to love the truth, do the truth, suffer for the truth;" for this, he promises, "wil bee a sure boult to keep out all Errors."[3]

1. Kem, Orders given out, pp. 5-6.
2. Ibid., pp. 11-14.
3. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

Although the anti-toleration writings enjoyed great popularity the Independents, joined with lawyers and "worldie profane men" in Parliament, succeeded in delaying the setting up of the Presbyterian Church-government; in March of 1646, Baillie wrote:

> The leaders of the people seem to be inclyned to have no shadow of a King; to have libertie for all religions; to have bot a lame Erastian Presbyterie; to be so injurious to us, as to chase us home with the sword.[1]

The hopes of the Presbyterian party were revived when the king surrendered himself to the Scottish Army at Newark; Baillie wrote (May 15, 1646) that "all good people are very joyfull of it" and that "matters goes much better;" he was only perplexed over the king's disposition to take the Covenant:

> If that man now goe to tinckle on Bishops and deliquents, and such foolish toyes, it seems he is mad; if he have the least grace or wisdome, he may, by God's mercy, presentlie end the miserie, wherein himselfe and many more are lyklie else to sinke.[2]

Before he left Oxford, the king had professed (Jan. 21, 1645) his readiness to consent to any good Acts for the suppression of Popery, the better preservation of "the Book of Common Prayer from scorn and violence" and for "the ease of tender consciences;"[3] these terms, however, had been rejected. At Newcastle, where the negotiations continued throughout the summer, the two main points of contention were the control of the militia and the ecclesiastical settlement. Parliament wanted to hold the power of the sword for a period of twenty years and the right to raise and dispose troops without royal assent for an additional twenty years; the king was to take the Covenant himself and to consent to an Act imposing it on

1. Baillie, Letters, vol. II, p. 362.
2. Ibid., pp. 371-372.
3. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 286-287.

England, Scotland and Ireland. The king delayed, his wife being "afraid of the consequences of surrendering control over the militia, and he himself was determined not to sacrifice the bishops."[1] In a letter to Bishop Juxon, September 30, 1646, the king writes:

> 'I need not tell you the many persuasions and threatenings that hath been used to me for making me change Episcopal into Presbyterial government, which absolutely to do is so directly against my conscience that by the grace of God no misery shall ever make me; but I hold myself obliged by all honest means to eschew the mischief of this too visible storm, and I think some kind of compliance with the iniquity of the times may be fit, as my case is, which at another time were unlawful. . . . I conceive the question to be whether I may with a safe conscience give way to this proposed temporary compliance, with a resolution to recover and maintain that doctrine and discipline wherein I have been bred. . . . for my regal authority once settled, I make no question of recovering Episcopal government, and God is my witness my chiefest end in regaining my power is to do the Church service. . . .'[2]

Juxon and Brian Duppa replied that considering the condition of his majesty's affairs they could not conceive his condescension in this matter any violation of his oath, as it was only a means to resettling the foundations of the church.[3] On October 15, Charles offered to accept the establishment of the Presbyterial Church Government for five years, after which "a regulated Episcopacy" should be returned; to the queen's encouragement that he yield more the king replied, "in language which she and her advisers could little relish:"

> 'I assure you that the change would be no less and worse than if Popery were brought in, for we should have neither lawful priests, nor sacraments duly administered, nor God publicly served, but according to the foolish fancy of every idle person; but we should have the doctrine against kings fiercelier set up than amongst the Jesuits.'[4]

Parliament, in the meantime, had proceeded in setting up the church government; in June of 1646 an "Erastian" system of Synods, Classes,

1. Tanner, op. cit., p. 139.
2. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., p. 135.
3. Vide Ibid., pp. 136-137.
4. Ibid., p. 138.

Lay Elders and Church Discipline had been approved; in September the House of Commons read bills by which Unitarians and free-thinking heretics could be put to death, and Baptists and other sectaries imprisoned for life.[1] On December 31, 1646, a bill was introduced to prohibit all persons from preaching except those ordained by a Reformed Church; the opponents sought to modify the bill so that laymen might be permitted to expound the Scriptures in places other than those appointed for public worship, but they, with Cromwell as one of their tellers, were defeated by a vote of 105 to 57.

> It is thereupon Resolved, &c. That this House doth declare, that they do dislike, and will proceed against all such Persons as shall take upon them to preach, or expound the Scriptures, in any Church or Chapel, or any other publick Place; except they be ordained, either here, or in some other Reformed Church, as it is already prohibited in an Order of both Houses; of the Six-and twentieth of April One thousand Six hundred Forty-five: And likewise against all such Ministers, or others, as shall publish and maintain, by Preaching, Writing, Printing, or any other way, any thing against or in Derogation of the Church-Government, which is now established by the Authority of both Houses of Parliament: And also against all and every Person or Persons, who shall willingly and purposely interrupt or disturb a Preacher, who is in the publick Exercise of his Function. And all Justices of Peace, Sheriffs, Mayors, Bailiffs, and other Head-officers of Corporations, and all officers of the Army, are to take Notice of this Declaration; and, by all lawful Ways and Means, to prevent offences of this kind; and to apprehend the offenders, and give Notice thereof unto this House; that thereupon Course may be speedily taken for a due Punishment to be inflicted on them.
>
> Ordered, That this Declaration be forthwith printed and published.
>
> Ordered, That the Knights and Burgesses of the several Counties and Places do send some of the said Declarations, so printed, into the several Counties and Places for which they serve; to be there published.[2]

The voting on this bill reveals the relative strength of the two parties in the House by the end of 1646; in February of 1647 the Scots, on receipt of their arrears, withdrew from England and left the king in the

1. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 228.
2. Journals of the House of Commons (Dec. 1646-1648) vol. 4., pp. 34-35. "31° Decembris 1646, Post Meridiem."

custody of the Parliament. Thus strengthened by the majority in Commons, the custody of the king's person and the tremendous influence of the City of London, the Presbyterian leaders turned to settle with "the army of sectaries," with which they displayed such a "want of worldly wisdom" that they wrecked the prospects of peace.[1] It was proposed that the New Model Army be reduced to garrison status with the exception of 4200 horse and 8400 foot to be sent to Ireland, that no member of Parliament be permitted to hold a commission in the army and that all officers be required to take the Covenant. Tanner says:

> In this way Parliament struck at the higher organisation of the army, and made a clean sweep of the Independent officers of the New Model. The soldiers might have disbanded quietly, but for the method adopted in dealing with arrears of pay. In March,1647, this was eighteen weeks for the infantry and forty-three weeks for the cavalry, and the men naturally asked that before they disbanded or re-enlisted for Ireland, these arrears for past service should be paid in full. Parliament only offered six weeks in cash--afterwards raised under pressure to eight weeks; the rest was to be discharged by 'debentures' issued 'upon the public faith'. Thus the soldiers fell an easy prey to the arguments of the politicians among them, who saw that if the army were once disbanded 'the sectaries would be broken'.[2]

In April each regiment chose two representatives or agents to explain their grievances to the generals; on April 30th three of these Agitators or adjutators presented themselves to Parliament and declared that the soldiers would neither disband nor enlist for service in Ireland until "the rights and liberties of the subjects should be vindicated and maintained."[3] Cromwell and others were sent to mediate between the House and the Army; they returned with a document of grievances, but Commons replied that the entire army of foot was to be disbanded, willing or unwilling. The Agitators petitioned Fairfax to assemble the whole army

1. Vide Tanner, op. cit., p. 141.
2. Tanner, op. cit., pp. 141-142.
3. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, p. 530.

for united action; Fairfax, "'forced to yield something out of order, to keep the army from disorder or worse inconveniences,'"[1] called for a rendezvous at Newmarket on June 4th. Up until this time Cromwell had worked for a reconciliation; from his seat in the House, he had urged Parliament to pay the soldiers, and from his quarters in the camp he had urged the soldiers to obey Parliament. Trevelyan says:

> He had been willing to disband the army, at the risk of the religious freedom for which he most cared, because he fully understood that the country could only be settled by peaceful and constitutional means. 'What we gain in a free way,' he said, 'is better than twice as much in a forced way, and will be more truly ours and our posterity's.'[2]

However, the Parliamentary leaders began to reorganize the City Militia and to talk secretly about bringing back the Scottish Army to humble the New Model; orders were sent to remove the artillery from Oxford to the Tower, and plans were made to bring the king from Holmby House to London.

Rumors of these things became "the signal for a general military revolt."[3] The Agitators told Cromwell if he would not come with them they would go their own way without him; on June 3rd, he slipped out of London and rode towards Newmarket; on the same day the artillery train at Oxford was seized, and Cornet Joyce with five hundred troopers appeared at Holmby House to conduct the king to the Army Headquarters. The Grand Council of the Army was formed out of the officers' council of war and the soldiers' council of Agitators, and a "Manifesto" was prepared, stating that they desired "Satisfaction to our undoubted Claims as Soldiers," reparation upon those who had defamed the army, "a Settlement

1. Dictionary of National Biography, vol. XVIII, p. 144.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 229.
3. Tanner, op. cit., p. 143.

of the Peace of the Kingdom and of the Liberties of the Subject:"

> We desire no alteration of the Civil Government. As little do we desire to interrupt, or in the least to intermeddle with, the settling of the Presbyterial Government. Nor did we seek to open a way for licentious liberty, under pretence of obtaining ease for tender conscience. . . . Only we could wish that every good citizen, and every man who walks peaceably in a blameless conversation, and is beneficial to the Commonwealth, might have liberty and encouragement; this being according to the true policy of all States, and even to justice itself.[1]

This was read in the House of Commons, and the eleven members who had offended the army withdrew; concessions were made for the soldiers' pay and the City Militia was restored to its old standing. However, riots broke out in London; preachers prayed for the strict observance of the Covenant and the suppression of the conventicles; pamphlets and petitions demanded the disbandment of the army and defence of the king's person and power; apprentices broke into Commons and forced the members to repeal the recent ordinances. For a while (July 30th to August 5th) some of the Presbyterian members tried to carry on; others joined with the Independents in placing themselves under Fairfax's protection. On August 6, 1647 the army occupied the city; the eleven members were expelled, and the Speakers were restored to their chairs; then the army retired.[2] Trevelyan says:

> . . . however fatal the use of force may have proved, the soldiers had been compelled to defend themselves against the basest ingratitude. Like cheating hucksters, the men whom they had saved denied them all things, material and spiritual, for which they and their dead comrades had risked their lives in the field. In defending themselves from gallows and prison, the Independents defended freedom of thought in England.[3]

The army now tried to come to terms with the king; on August 1, 1647 the Council put forward "The Heads of the Proposals," wherein the control of all militia was to rest in Parliament for ten years; the existing

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, pp. 247-251.
2. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 230.
3. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 231.

Parliament was to be dissolved and with a redistribution of seats future Parliaments were to be biennial; "all coercive power, authority, and jurisdiction of Bishops and all other Ecclesiastical Officers" were to be taken away; the taking of the Covenant was not to be enforced; and all acts were to be repealed which imposed

> any penalty for not coming to church, or for meetings elsewhere for prayer or other religious duties, exercises or ordinances, and some other provision to be made for discovering of Papists and Popish recusants, and for disabling of them, and of all Jesuits or priests from disturbing the State.[1]

Although the proposals offered more to the king than any other plan of settlement, he only used them to bargain more out of Parliament; while he stalled, the radical party in the army grew bolder and stronger; they wanted Republicanism and Universal Suffrage. Cromwell and Ireton argued that such proposals would result in utter confusion; Cromwell reminded them that in contemplating any political change it must be considered "'whether the spirit and temper of the people of this nation are prepared to go along with it.'"[2] He told them that he had been informed by some of the king's party,

> that if they give us rope enough we will hang ourselves. [We shall hang ourselves] if we do not conform to the rules of war. And therefore I shall move [that] what we shall centre upon [must be the rules of war and our authority from the Parliament. We must not let go of that] if it have but the face of authority.[3]

The king's escape from Hampton Court (November 11, 1647) and flight to the Isle of Wight brought mutiny of the army's radicals. With papers of "the Agreement of the People" in their hats, the "levellers" drove away

1. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 316-326.
2. Ut per Firth, Cromwell, pp. 182-184.
3. A. S. P. Woodhouse, Puritanism and Liberty, Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the CLARKE MANUSCRIPTS with Supplementary Documents, (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1938), (November 1, 1647), p. 98. Woodhouse says that these debates which the army had at Putney "mark the gulf that is widening between the Independents and their allies of the Left." Ibid., "Introduction," pp. 28-29.

their officers and assembled to sieze Cromwell as a traitor to their cause, when Cromwell rode into their midst and, with his sword drawn, made them pluck the papers from their hats and yield to his command; three of the leaders were arrested and made to throw dice for their lives; the loser was shot on the field--and the mutiny was over. Thereafter, the army refused to treat further with the king, replying to his message that they were the army of the Parliament and all matters must be referred to that body. The Parliament sent an ultimatum which demanded the direct control of the militia for twenty years, the independency of Parliament and the settling of the Presbyterian government and directory, with the following qualifications:

> That no persons whatsoever shall be liable to any question or penalty for nonconformity to the form of government and Divine Service appointed in the said Ordinances; and that all such persons as shall not conform to the said form of government and Divine Service, shall have liberty to meet for the service and worship of God, and for the exercise of religious duties and ordinances, in any fit and convenient places, so as nothing be done by them to the disturbance of the peace of the kingdom: . . .
>
> That nothing in this provision shall extend to any toleration of the Popish religion, nor to exempt any Popish recusants from any penalties imposed upon them for the exercise of the same.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> That this indulgence shall not extend to tolerate the use of the Book of Common Prayer in any place whatsoever.
>
> That liberty shall be given to all Ministers of the Gospel, though they cannot conform to the present Government in all things, being not under sequestration, nor sequesterable, to preach any lecture or lecturers, in any church or chapel, where they shall be desired by the inhabitants thereof; provided that it be not at such hours as the Minister of the said parish doth ordinarily preach himself, and shall receive such means and maintenance as doth, or shall, thereunto appertain.[1]

Firth says that Charles, "driven to extremity by this demand," turned again to the Scottish Commissioners and secretively signed (Dec. 27, 1647) "The Engagement,"[2] whereby the Scots promised to restore the king to all

1. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 345-346.
2. Firth, Cromwell, p. 188.

the rights of his crown in return for three years of established Presbyterianism in England with the rigid suppression of the opinions and practices of the sectarians; it was also agreed that "all armies" be disbanded, and in case this should not be granted

> an army shall be sent from Scotland into England, for preservation and establishment of religion, for defence of His Majesty's person and authority, and restoring him to his government, to the just rights of the Crown and his full revenues, for defence of the privileges of Parliament and liberties of the subject, for making a firm union between the kingdoms, under His Majesty and his posterity, and settling a lasting peace.[1]

Two days later, the king rejected Parliament's ultimatum, and on January 17, 1648 both Houses voted to made "no further addresses or applications to the King."[2]

The Second Civil War began in Wales, with the governor of Pembroke Castle openly declaring for the king (March 1648); in April Lord Inchiquin in Ireland went over to the royalists, and within the same month Langdale seized Berwick, opening the door into England for the gathering Scottish army. Cromwell tried to unite the various factors of the Good Old Cause, but the sympathies of many were directed toward the Forty-thousand Scots; riots broke out in the streets, and their cries for 'God and King Charles!' were silenced only by a "desperate charge of cavalry."[3] The army was confused and divided; the Cause for which they had fought and which God had prospered was now breaking into bits. Some were thinking of laying down their arms and of submitting to the approaching suffering; others suggested that the whole army should

> search-out our own iniquities, and humble our souls before the Lord in the sense of the same; which we were persuaded, had

1. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 348-350.
2. Ibid., pp. 355-356.
3. Vide Morley, op. cit., p. 248. Also Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, pp. 285-286.

provoked the Lord against us, to bring such sad perplexities upon us at that day.[1]

The prayer-meetings began the last of April at Windsor Castle, but the first days brought no result and both soldiers and officers continued to seek "the causes of that sad dispensation;" on May 1st Cromwell joined them, suggesting that they all look back to the time when "the Lord was amongst us" and try to find in prayer when the army had "provoked Him to depart from us." The army returned to its prayers and searchings, and according to Adjutant Allen, on the third day they found the source of their sin to have been in

> 'those cursed carnal Conferences our own conceited wisdom, our fears, and want of faith had prompted us, the year before, to entertain with the King and his Party. And at this time, and on this occasion, did the then Major Goffe (as I remember was his title) make use of that good Word, Proverbs First and Twenty-third, Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you. Which, we having found out our sin, he urged as our duty from those words. And the Lord so accompanied by His Spirit, that it had a kindly effect, like a word of His, upon most of our hearts that were then present: which begot in us a great sense, a shame and loathing of ourselves for our iniquities, and a justifying of the Lord as righteous in His proceedings against us.
>
> And in this path the Lord led us, not only to see our sin, but also our duty; and this so unanimously set with weight upon each heart, that none was able hardly to speak a word to each other for bitter weeping, . . . partly in the sense and shame of our iniquities; of our unbelief base fear of men, and carnal consultations (as the fruit thereof) with our own wisdoms, and not with the Word of the Lord,--which only is a way of wisdom, strength and safety, and all besides it are ways of snares. And yet we were also helped, with fear and trembling, to rejoice in the Lord; whose faithfulness and loving-kindness, we were made to see, yet failed us not;--who remembered us still, even in our low estate, because His mercy endures for ever. Who no sooner brought us to His feet, acknowledging Him in that way of His (viz. searching for, being ashamed of, and willing to turn from, our iniquities), but He did direct our steps; and presently we were led and helped to a clear agreement amongst ourselves, not any dissenting, That it was the duty of our day, with the forces we had, to go out and fight against those potent enemies, which that year in all places appeared

1. Adjutant Allen, "A faithful Memorial of that remarkable Meeting of many officers of the Army in England at Windsor Castle, in the Year 1648," etc., ut per Carlyle Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, pp. 286-288.

> against us. . . . With an humble confidence, in the name of the Lord only, that we should destroy them. And we were also enabled then, after serious seeking His face, to come to a very clear and joint resolution, on many grounds at large there debated amongst us, That it was our duty, if ever the Lord brought us back again in peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for that blood he had shed, and mischief he had done to his utmost, against the Lord's Cause and People in these poor Nations.[1]

Trevelyan writes: "In such fierce exaltation the military saints again rode forth to war, carrying with them their chiefs, made captive to their doctrines against reason and against will, by the force of fate and the irretrievable event."[2] For a time it looked as if all would yet be lost; the Eastern counties petitioned Parliament to restore the king "'to the splendour of his ancestors;'" a part of the fleet declared for the king, and in July 10,000 Scottish troopers crossed the border, "declaring that they had come to put down 'that impious toleration, settled by the two Houses contrary to the Covenant.'"[3] The New Model Army lost no time in answering the challenge; Fairfax put down the revolt in Kent and Essex, and Cromwell restored order in Wales; the Cavalier horsemen scattered and vanished, but if the Scottish Army could reach the Midland plain, all would be undone. Cromwell commanded his soldiers to meet them; on the long hard march from Wales into Yorkshire, shoes and stockings wore out, but these tattered veterans marched "with fire in their hearts,"[4] for they knew that the fate of their nation depended upon the settlement they made with the army of 21,000 men which Hamilton confidently was leading southward. Discrediting the report that Cromwell was near, Hamilton was unprepared for the fierce attack which was made upon his extended lines

1. Allen, "A faithful Memorial," ut per Carlyle, Cromwell's Letters, vol. I, pp. 289-290.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 236.
3. Tanner, op. cit., p. 150.
4. Morley, Cromwell, p. 253.

through a pass in the Pennine Range. For three days the battle raged in torrents of rain, and when the rain ceased on Saturday (August 19, 1648), Cromwell's 8600 men were in charge of the field—and England!

Nevertheless, Parliament resumed its negotiations with the king, as if nothing had happened at Preston; on September 18th, a Commission met the king at Newport where he conceded the establishment of the Presbyterian system for three years with a limited Episcopacy afterwards, the Parliamentary control of the militia for twenty years and the settlement of Ireland as the Parliament desired—concessions which, he confided to a friend, were made only to cover his escape.[1] The army did not like the shape which such a treaty made of the future; all confidence had been lost in the king, and in the treaty there was no guarantee of political and religious liberties; all for which they had fought six years was to be sacrificed for three years of Presbyterianism. Regiment after regiment petitioned against the treaty and demanded that the authors of the second war be punished. Having fought under precarious circumstances, with the House of Lords refusing to declare the Scottish army an invading enemy and with many in Commons hoping for the defeat of their own soldiers, they now witnessed pardon to "traitors" and the prospect of a treaty with "the chief instigator" of all their troubles; Cromwell endorsed their petitions. However, the House of Commons would not even consider their Remonstrance and continued their discussion of his majesty's concessions; on Dec. 1, 1648 a group of army officers seized the king and the next day the army marched to London. On December 5th Commons voted the king's concessions "a ground of settlement;" the next morning Colonel Pride's men "purged" the Parliament of one hundred and twenty-nine members; when asked by what law or authority this was done, Hugh Peters replied,

1. Vide Firth, Cromwell, p. 208.

"'It is by the Law of Necessity; truly, by the Power of the Sword.'"[1] On December 23rd, "the Rump," as the remainder of the House of Commons came to be called, appointed a committee "to consider how to proceed in the way of justice against the King;"[2] on January 4th it was declared that "the people are, under God, the original of all just power" and that as the people's representatives the House of Commons has supreme power and need the consent of neither the king nor the House of Peers; two days later an ordinance was passed, calling Charles Stuart to account for having endeavored to establish an arbitrary and tyrannical government and for having waged a cruel war against the people.[3] On January 20th, the trial began, "in the name of the Commons in Parliament assembled and all the good people of England;" witnesses and documents were produced to show that the king had invited foreign troops to invade England and that he had led an army against Parliament. On January 27th the sixty-seven commissioners assembled to pass sentence; when Charles was led from the hall, soldiers shouted "Execution," and blew their tobacco smoke in his face.[4] Outside the people wept; the deed done in their name was not of their desire, and the very act which sought to declare the equality of men, annointed kingship with a new meaning. As he stood on the scaffold, January 30th, 1649, Charles spoke words which seemed partly of the past but which stirred thoughts of the future:

> For the people truly I desire their liberty and freedom as much as anybody whatsoever; but I must tell you, their liberty and freedom consists in having government, those laws by which their lives and goods may be most their own. It is not their having a share in the government; that is nothing appertaining to them. A subject and a

1. Vide Carlyle's notes in Cromwell's Letters, vol. II, p. 90.
2. Vide Firth, Cromwell, pp. 215-216.
3. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, pp. 237-238.
4. Vide Firth, Cromwell, pp. 218-228.

> sovereign are clear different things. . . . If I would have give way to have all changed according to the power of the sword, I needed not to have come here; and therefore I tell you (and I pray God it be not laid to your charge) that I am the martyr of the people.[1]

Although the sword gave the decisive blow in settling the issue of toleration, the pen also had been employed in the struggle. In What the Independents would have (1647), John Cook wrote that Liberty of Conscience was the only cure for all the differences and divisions of the land; "compulsion can no more gain the heart," he declares, "then the fish can love the fisher-man."[2] The Independent "thinks it strange that none but in office may preach . . ., and marvels why a man may not preach by his tongue as well as by his pen; . . . he thinks him not zealous of mens salvation, that murmurs at all mens preaching that are not fashioned in his shop."[3] Having drawn his sword for public liberties, Cook declares that the Independent will gladly sheath it in hope that none will deny him

> those liberties which were purchased for him by the blood of Christ, knowing that a Communion of Unity will be a glorious supplement to the rent of Uniformity, which may seeme strange for a time, but will quickly be embraced by all honest men.[4]

The Independents found unexpected allies in some churchmen whom the misfortunes of war had mellowed to favor a limited toleration within a national church. In The Religion of Protestants, Chillingworth suggests an established church in which everyone will be granted freedom to express his beliefs as long as there is no question of the fundamental principles

1. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 239.
2. John Cook, What the Independents would have . . . (7 lines), (London: for Giles Calvert), 1647, pp. 10-11.
3. Ibid., pp. 14-15.
4. Ibid., p. 16.

of religion and morality; he expresses the hope that free and charitable discussion would lead ultimately to substantial agreement.[1] In 1647 Jeremy Taylor, one of the king's own chaplains, published his Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying, in which he shows the uncharitableness and the unreasonableness of prescribing other men's faith; since we know in part and prophesy in part, we should not despise those who differ with us, for as long as we keep to the foundations of faith and obedience, we shall be saved.[2] There will always be a variety of opinions, because "there is variety of humane understandings, and uncertainty in things;" therefore, "no man should be so forward in perscribing to others, nor invade that liberty which God hath left to us intire by propounding many things obscurely, and by exempting our souls and understandings from all powers externally compulaory."[3] It would be hard to think that all Papists and Anabaptists were "fooles and wicked persons," for surely there are many wise and good men among all sects. It would be as unreasonable to cut off a man's head because of a wart upon his cheek as it is to declare "capitall and damnable" any variation of opinion upon the nonessential matters.[4] Taylor writes:

> If the persons be Christians in their lives, and Christians in their profession, if they acknowledge the Eternall Sonne of God for their Master and their Lord, and live in all relations as becomes persons making such professions, why then should I hate such persons whom God loves, and who love God, who are partakers of Christ, and Christ hath a title to them, who dwell in Christ, and Christ in them, because their understandings have not been brought up like mine, have not had the same Masters, they have not met with the same books, nor the same company, or have not the same interest, or are not so wise, or else are wiser, (that is, for some reason or other which I neither doe understand, nor ought to blame) have not the same opinions that I have and do not determine their Schoole questions to the sense of my Sect or interest.[5]

1. Vide Gardiner, Civil War, p. 311.
2. Ier. Taylor, A Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying . . . (4 lines), (London: for R. Royston), 1647, pp. 10-11.
3. Ibid., p. 13.
4. Ibid., p. 15.
5. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

Such noble sentiments were rare at that time; the coarse and brutal sneers of those who copied the "Water-poet" Taylor were more typical of their day.[1] Throughout 1647-1648 the slander-satires against the tub-preachers continued to come from the press. This passage from Grand Pluto's Progresse through Great Britaine (1647) is mildly typical:

> Not farre from these a crew were seated round,
> A cobler who began for to expound,
> He knew the length of all their feet and he
> Would not to humour them a Preacher be:
> Lord what a hurly burly was there there,
> 'Mongst those that came this man devout to heare,
> While some applauded him, some him gainesaid:
> Not farre from these there by a River staid
> A Multitude of maies and wives who strove
> Who should the first the waters might approve,
> And be baptiz'd anew, while some were drench'd
> Their hot and fierie humours well were quench'd
> Some adding fewell were unto the fire,
> And Brothers giving Sisters their desire.[2]

"A Lover of God and King Charles" composed (1647) an Old Protestants Letanie, of which we may quote these lines:

> From all Sects and Schisme, and all false opinions,
> From Brownists, from Amilists, and from Arminians,
> Which long have molested the King and's Dominions;
> Liberanos audi nos.
> From John Presbyter and James Independant,
> (Who are to catch others in malice transcendent)
> Who still stir up strife and would ne'r know an end on't
> Liberanos audi nos.
> . . . . . .
> From all preaching women, and expounding Weavers,
> From Broom-men and Coblers, who do their endevors,
> To draw to their Conventicles honest Beleevers,
> Liberanos audi nos.[3]

In Tub-preachers overturned, the writer makes this verse for Tho. Watson

1. Vide "John Taylor (1580-1653)", Dictionary of National Biography, vol. LV, p. 433. As "coarse and brutal" as they are, Taylor's writings "accurately mirror his age."
2. G. W., Grand Pluto's Progresse . . . (9 lines), 1647, pp. 9-10.
3. The old Protestants Letanie . . . (6 lines), 1647.

who was married in Moor fields by a tailor:

> We Saints more freedom have then other men,
> To marry at mid-night, or no matter when;
> Whene'er a sister promise, she'l indeavor
> To keep her word, or do the deed however.[1]

Wishing such "Devil's Journeymen" to be departed to their new Canaan, the writer demands

> of your Independant illiterate partie, man or woman, by what specious Ordination, or Call, ordinarie or extraordinarie, doe ye intrude your selves into our Pulpits to infect or touch our congregations with your Leprous Doctrines? In this ye imitate the Devils practice, Job 1 In the day the sonnes of God appeared before God, Satan likewise came in amongst them, but for hurt and affliction of godly Iob. . . .[2]

A long list of the "illiterate, mechanick, nonsensical cobled-fustian-Tubbers" is published with the names of the "women-Tubbers, alias Dubbers;" we are also given a poem on the lace-maker who taught a sanctified brother how to exercise his gifts.[3]

The lay-divine, tells of a zealous taylor who, transported with fancy and following the example of the Separatist minister, leaves his trade and assembles "two or three couples of his own Hall, with their doxies" to announce that God had commanded him to be a teacher and so proceeds to preach a sermon, upon which "the silly Schismaticks" admiring his gifts proceed to vote him "set apart for pious uses." The writer exclaims that "all things go backward" and wishes for the old Roman system of requiring each man to wear in his hat a symbol of his trade, whereby cobblers could be distinguished from preachers and hatters from scholars.[4] As in the time of Micah there were priests who performed their duties for private gain, so now there are ministers who forsake the temple of God

1. Tub-preachers overturn'd, or Independency to be Abandoned and Abhor'd, . . . (19 lines), (London:for George Lindsey), 1647, p. 9.
2. Ibid., pp. 10-11.
3. Ibid., p. 16.
4. The lay-divine, or the simple house-preaching taylor, . . . (2 lines), (London: for W. Ley), 1647, pp. 3-4.

with hope of private profit and cause lay-men to think they too can forsake their trades and take to preaching; prophets and apostles have warned against such evil times and have foretold the judgment of God upon such a land as tolerates such blasphemies.[1] If this kingdom becomes a field of blood, with brother sheathing his sword in his brother's bowels, men will ask: Wherefore is all this? and we shall have "no account to give but this, The blind zeale of the Sectaries, the irregular courses of the Schismaticks, and the impious boldnesse of house-Preachers have occasioned it."[2]

The anti-tolerationists were not alone in the use of bitter language; there was a flood of anti-clerical pamphlets which seem to vie with each other in denouncing and abusing the new clergy. For example, R. Lawrance, in The Wolf Stript of his Sheeps Clothing (1647), addresses "the cruel, wicked, antichristian, blood-thirsty clergy" who not only reject "the glorious spiritual shinings of that sun of righteousness" but strive to suppress "the least glimmerings of it in others."[3] The false Christs spoken of in Scripture are not the "poor illiterate mechanick fellows," for so were Christ and the apostles called (Matt. 13:55, Acts 4:13); the great deceivers are not those who are "forc'd to run up and down the Country, sculking here and there in private places to broach their opinions to some poor despised people," for these have no power to be persecutors (Matt. 10:17-18, Mk. 13:8-9).[4]

> Have not those which have called themselves the Reverend clergy, the Learned Tribe of Levi, the Bishops, Pastors and Ministers of Christs Church, been far above a thousand yeers, to the begining of this Parliament, the great deceivers, the grand Sectaries, the chief

1. The lay-divine, pp. 5-6.
2. Ibid., p. 6.
3. R. Lawrance, The Wolf Stript of his Sheeps Clothing . . . (13 lines), (London), 1647, "Intro. Epistle."
4. Ibid., p. 5.

> sowers of Sedition, the very Throne and Body of Antichrist, and the proudest enemies to the Church of God?[1]

Under the pretence of reforming the Church of its heresy and schism, they have "deformed it into formality, supersitition, and idolatry;" does not "all the blood both of England and Ireland stand upon the stone of these bloody men," who now seek to build "a new Babel out of the old rubbish . . . giving that great skarlet whore, a new dress."[2] Thomas Collier's A Brief Discovery of the Corruption of the ministry of the Church of England (1647), is a retaliation on Mr. Edwards; condemning the clergy for their dependence upon tithes, Collier declares:

> Those who cannot preach without tythes, or any other stinted maintenance, it is an argument they seek more their own bellies then the honour of Iesus Christ, like unto your day-laborers, that would be sure to know their pay, or else they will not work, such belly-gods are they, that if any put not into their mouths, they even prepare War against them.[3]

Like the priests of old, they build tombs for the old prophets and ridicule the new ones; they have the magistrates to pass laws against the liberty in which the truth might be proclaimed and their own sins revealed. Was not Christ a carpenter, Paul a tentmaker and Peter a fisherman? Yet if God today should raise up any carpenter or cobbler to proclaim his will, the priests would cry out against him: "O, away with such a fellow from the earth! he is a Mechanick fellow, one of no breeding, he knoweth not the original, &c."[4] Our priests have made a Diana out of their learning and would have men honor and pay them for their "Arts and parts;" we must not contradict them or else they will get an ordinance from the House of Lords preventing any from differing with their human teaching. These spiritual

1. Lawrance, The Wolf Stript, p. 9.
2. Ibid., pp. 12-13.
3. T. C., A Brief discovery of the Corruption of the ministry of the Church of England . . . (9 lines), (London), 1647, pp. 8-9.
4. Ibid., p. 13.

merchants, who like apprentices spend seven years learning their trade and then are approved by men in the same trade, have their shops and special market-days so that they can spread forth their wares for sale. They patch up old sermons like a cobbler mends old shoes, but the Spirit, they know not for

> this is that [which] will throw down these poor tradesmen, Coblers, Taylors, Tinkers, Plough-men, Carpenters, all sorts of men shall preach the everlasting Gospel with so much light, life and power, that will darken all the light of these Sermon makers, and then none will buy their wares any more.[1]

In fear of competition, they have an ordinance to compel men to receive what they bring forth; "they have gotten their Patentees to Monopolize all to themselves, none must sel, nay none may give when they sell; a wonderful way to inrich themselves, was there ever such a thing as this heard of?" He calls upon Parliament to withdraw this "Patentee for the Monopoly of Preaching," declaring that

> it is the Subjects liberty to expect it; it is that for which they have adventured their lives, suffered the loss of their estates, and therefore it cannot but be a great bondage and burthen unto the Subjects to see and feel the heavy yoke remaining. However, God will take their Patentee from them, for the Saints must speak those things they have seen and heard.[2]

Thomas Collier took part in the army debates at Whitehall[3] and preached at the headquarters at Putney. In his sermon, A Discovery of the New Creation (Sept. 29, 1647), he opposes the opinion that Christ will personally return and reign upon the earth by saying that

> Christ will come in the Spirit and have a glorious kingdom in the spirits of his people, and they shall, by the power of Christ in them, reign over the world, and this is the new heaven and the new earth.[4]

1. T. C., A Brief discovery, pp. 25-26.
2. Ibid., pp. 31-32.
3. Vide Woodhouse, op. cit., pp. 125, 164-165.
4. Ut per Woodhouse, op. cit., p. 390.

While he seeks to confirm this understanding by the Scripture, he says, "'I trust I shall deliver nothing unto you but experimental truth.'"[1] In speaking of the new spiritual liberty he says there shall be, in respect of the ministry, a "'single ministration of the Spirit'" wherein men will pray, preach and prophesy in the Spirit, which will deliver Saints from fleshly actings into the glorious liberty of spiritual actings, that they shall no more act from a legal principle to the law without them, but from a principle of light, life, liberty, and power within them.

> 'Thus God will create a new heaven, a new church estate in the Spirit, which will produce spiritual communion, spiritual joy and gladness amongst the Saints, who live in this light and glory.'[2]

Fortunately there were more moderate men who took part in the debate of the toleration of lay-preachers. In addressing his pamphlet, Preaching without ordination (1647) to the National Synod, Lieutenant Edmond Chillenden says:

> I have observed in my travills, since God called me into this Army, that in many of the counties of England, there is not one Parish of tenn that hath one of your ordained men that is able to preach Christ, these things generally I have taken notice of that where any of them are, they are either Drunkards, unclean persons, dumb Idols, or at the best cruel Malignants that have ever been opposite to the glory of God. . . . I hope you will all of you to the utmost of your powers indeavor that Christ may be preached in every part and corner of this Kingdome. . . .
>
> What if some which are called Sectaries, and that of the Army have preached Christ out of envy and contention, and not sincerely; howsoever I know, and many thousand soules besides me can testifie that Christ hath been preached, yea, and that effectually and powerfully to the prayse and glory of God, and the comfort of many hearts. . . . therefore my thinks you and all people should rejoyce, that Christ is preached, and God made knowne.[3]

Chillenden asks the members of the Assembly to refrain from "that envious

1. Ut per Woodhouse, op. cit., p. 390.
2. Ibid., p. 393.
3. Edmund Chillenden, Preaching Without Ordination, . . . (14 lines) (London: for George Whittington), 1647. "To the Synod."

spirit in causing the Magistrate to forbid us soldiers from preaching" and to follow the advice of Gamaliel (Acts 5:38-39) lest they find themselves "fighters against God." He reasons that if the church is to ordain able officers, it must first try them, for the office does not give the gifts but only "a solemn charge and commission" to those who have already proven their gifts. To prove "the lawfulnesse of all the Servants of God preaching before Ordination," Chillenden cites: (1) Numbers 11:26-30 wherein Moses wishes that all the Lord's people were prophets; (2) II Chron. 17:7-9, wherein Jehosaphat sent his princes to teach in the cities of Judah; (3) Acts 18:24, the preaching of Apollos; (4) Acts 18:1-4, 11:19-24, the preaching of the scattered Christians; and (5) I Peter 4:10-11 wherein gifted men are urged to minister to each other as good stewards of the grace of God.[1] God gives His gifts to whomsoever He chooses and enables the lowly as well as the learned to prophesy or preach; if the Spirit "blows" upon a cobbler, tinker, chimneysweeper, plowman or any other tradesman, why should they not be permitted to manifest the glory of God in declaring the gospel unto others? It would "evidence a good heart in the Levites of our times to presse" all who are able to preach Jesus Christ to do so that the whole earth might be full of the knowledge of God's glory. Nowhere in the Scriptures do magistrates forbid men to preach because they lack ordination; rather, every wise man was encouraged to speak in the synagogue. Apollos surely was not extraordinarily gifted as he had need to be taught, and if the persecuted Christians were extraordinarily inspired, why was Barnabas sent to Antioch to settle and confirm the work done by their preaching? Perhaps these did not go up into pulpits, dressed in long black robes, but they published what they knew and de-

1. Chillenden, Preaching Without Ordination, pp. 6-12.

clared what the spirit had revealed to them, which is "the substance of preaching the Gospel."[1] The ministration of gifts (I Peter 4:10-11) can not be restricted to outward hospitality, for the apostle specifically lists speaking or preaching. Nor were the Corinthian prophets extraordinarily inspired inasmuch as women were forbidden to speak, which would have contradicted the Spirit and the Scriptures had they been extraordinarily inspired; by forbidding women from preaching, the Apostle gives liberty to all gifted men to preach.[2] As for the"sending" (Rom. 10:15), the giving of gifts to preach is commission enough to use them (Rom. 10: 13-18). In I Cor. 7:20 the apostle uses "a calling" for the larger meaning of social relation, as bond or free, Jew or Gentile, married or single; nowhere in Scripture is preaching made a trade, but throughout the entire Scripture preaching is laid down as "the general calling which belongs to all the saints." God has laid a responsibility upon all men who believe in Christ to declare his gospel as faithful stewards of the gifts and graces of God, and no man may forbid them without breaking God's holy will and commandment. "Therefore, Reader, if God perswade thy heart to the acknowledgement of this truth, fear not to practice it though men divels set themselves against thee, yet know that God is faithful."[3]

In A Vindication of the Judgement of the Reformed Churches (1647), Lazarus Seaman undertakes to answer Lt. Chillenden's pamphlet as well as one by Sidrach Simpson on ordination. Seaman declares that he who says that no act of ministers or elders is essential to the making of a minister argues either for "Erastianisme, that there is no Church-power or order; Brownisme, that all power is in the body of the people; or Enthusiasme,

1. Chillenden, Preaching Without Ordination, pp. 13-14.
2. Ibid., pp. 20-22.
3. Ibid., p. 25.

that every man is to act . . . as he is lead by inspiration, without respect to politie."[1] It is granted that a man is called by God when he is approved to be of eminent gifts, but who is to be the judge—the man himself, his friends or those ministers who are competent to judge in this matter?[2] A minister may want ordination in times of persecution or in some extraordinary circumstances and God may send a voice from heaven to commission him to bring men "out of Babylon" but such exceptional cases do not warrant men to take upon themselves that responsibility in ordinary times. To prove that a man needs "an Externall mediate calling by men (in the ordinary state of the Church)," Seaman cites: Jer. 14:14, 23:21; I Tim. 3:2; Rom. 10:15; Heb. 5:4; II Cor. 3:1; Acts 1:21-22. He also quotes from the confessions of the Reformed Churches:

> The French Confession, Article 31. 'We believe that it is not lawfull for any man, upon his own authority, to take upon him the government of the Church; but that every one ought to be admitted thereunto by a lawfull Election, so neer as may be, and so long as the Lord giveth leave.'
>
> The Augustane Confession, Article 14. 'Concerning Ecclesiasticall Orders they teach, that no man should publikely in the church teach, or minister the Sacraments, except he be rightly called: according as St. Paul giveth commandement to Titus, to ordain Elders in every city.'
>
> The latter conf. of Helvetia, Chap. 18. 'Furthermore, no man ought to usurp the honour of the Ecclesiasticall Ministery, that is to say, greedily to pluck it to him by bribes, or any evill shifts, or of his own accord. We do here therefore condemn all those which run of their own accord, being neither chosen, sent, nor ordained.'
>
> The Conf. of Wirtemberg, Art. 20. 'Neither is it unknown, that Christ in his Church hath instituted Ministers, who should Preach his Gospel, and administer the Sacraments. Neither is it to be permitted to every one, although he be a spirituall Priest, to usurp a publike Ministery in the Church, without a lawfull calling.'
>
> The English Conf. 'Further we say, that the Minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred to that office of the Church of God; and that no man hath power to wrest himself into the Holy Ministery at his own pleasure.'

1. Lazarus Seaman, A Vindication of the Judgement of the Reformed Churches . . . (4 lines), (London: by T.R. & E. M.), 1647, p. 4.
2. Ibid., p. 26.

The Saxon Confession. 'We do retain in our Churches alsoe the publike rite of Ordination, whereby the Ministery of the Gospel is commended to those that are truly chosen, whose manners and doctrine we do first throughly examine.'

The Belgick Confess. Art. 31. 'We believe that the Ministers, Seniors, and Deacons, ought to be called to their functions, and by the lawfull Election of the Church to be advanced into those rooms; earnest prayer being made unto God; and after the order and manner which is set down unto us in the Word of God.'[1]

Addressing Lt. Chillenden by name, Seaman asks: whereas Jehosaphat sent princes, who sent you and such as you? The liberty given in the Jewish synagogue is not a precedent for the Christian churches; neither does the activity of the dispersed disciples warrant the preaching of unauthorized men today, because there was then no order established or it was dissolved. As for the gifts implying their usage, Seaman answers that each man is to use his gifts with respect to the gifts themselves and to his place and calling; thus private people are to use their gifts in a private way, and public officers in a public way, with the duty of preaching belonging to those who are called unto it in regular times in the ordinary way of ordination. Concerning the prophets of the Corinthian Church, Seaman believes that as they were next unto the apostles and before pastors and teachers (I Cor. 12:28-29) and that there is no other kind of prophet or prophesying in the public congregation below the ministers and their ministry "in any enumeration of Scripture."[2]

In 1648 Lt. Chillenden got another answer, Church-members Set In Joynt by Fidodexter Transilvanus, whom Dexter identifies as Benjamin Woodbridge.[3] It is granted that all Christians may exhort and comfort one another, that in an unsettled condition of the church it may be necessary for private gifted Christians to preach, that it is the

1. Seaman, A Vindication.
2. Ibid.
3. Dexter, op. cit., "Appendix," p. 68.

Christian's duty to exhort those under him to the general duties of religion, but Woodbridge declares:

> That it is utterly unlawfull for any Christian whatsoever, gifted or not gifted, to take upon him ordinarily to Preach the Word in the name of the Lord with all authority before the Church publiquely assembled, unlesse he be called and set apart thereto by the Church.[1]

Moses' wish was that the extraordinary spirit of prophesy which had rested upon Eldad and Medad might rest upon all the Lord's people; "this I am perswaded is the sincere desire of every faithfull Minister . . . that your selfe (Mr. Chillenden) and all Christians might have the same spirituall gifts which they have . . . ," but this is no ground for a man to run before he is sent (Jer. 23:21).[2] The pouring out of spirit endowed and ordained men of old, like Amos, and for their authority to preach they cited their call and not their own abilities; the disciples were called and sent before they were gifted with the Holy Ghost, but they did not preach before they were commissioned (Jno. 20:21, Rom. 10:15). In Luke 11:33-36 Christ distinguishes between the lights of his ministers and those of private Christians; the lights of ministers are to be put in the candlestick which is the church (Rev. 1:12-13) that they more eminently may shine forth (Acts 13:47), while private Christians are to become enlightened so as to make themselves, in their own places, lightsome and glorious in the church.[3] Talents must not be hid in napkins, but that does not warrant a man's usurping the throne because he thinks himself more gifted than the king.

> . . . this excellent principle (miserably perverted) hath been the dark cellar wherein that powder that been hid, which hath almost

1. Fidodexter Transilvanus [Benjamin Woodbridge], Church-members Set in Joynt . . . (18 lines), (London:for Edmund Paxton), 1648, pp. 2-3.
2. Ibid., pp. 5-6.
3. Ibid., pp. 10-12.

> blown up all Government, both in the State and Church, and Army, and hurld all things into black confusion. And I am sorry that any of my Country-men (especially such as pretend to Religion and the feare of God) should border so neere upon the Spirit of Corah, as to be of the same mind, and to speak the same language, Numb. 16.3. They gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron saying, You take too much vpon you, seeing all the Congregation are Holy every one of them, and the Lord is amongst them: wherefore then lift up your selves against the Congregation of the Lord? The same answer therefore, which Moses gives to them, may I returne to Chillenden, and all others that make use of this Argument, ver. 9,10. Seemeth it but a small thing to you, that the God of Israel hath separated you.—and hath brought you neere to him—and seeke you the Priesthood also?[1]

If a man be gifted, God expects him to use that gift in his own place and calling (Rom. 12:4); if he desires the office of a Bishop, let him be proved and ordained (I Tim. 3:1-10, 5:22). The princes of Judah accompained the priests and Levites (II Chron. 17:7-9), not to teach, but that they might compel the people to hear and obey the Levites. The "wise men" were tutors or professors of divinity (II Kings 22:14, 2:15 and I Sam. 10:12) and therefore had the right to teach. As for the custom of the Jews, Christ did not speak in the synagogue until he was thirty years old and the miracles which he had performed made him esteemed as a Prophet sent of God; the fame of Paul and Barnabas spread before them, so that they were considered great teachers and prophets. It is not proved that Apollos was not ordained; he is classed with Paul and Peter (I Cor. 1:12); and it is likely he was "an Evangelist, as Timothy was, and so no setled officer in any Church, but an itenerant Preacher to every church where he came."[2] If private Christians preached during the Jerusalem persecution, it was because of the necessity in being scattered away from their teachers and thus the necessity was their authorization rather than an ordination; however they all (Acts 8:1) could refer to the seventy

1. Woodbridge, Church-members Set in Joynt, pp. 14-15.
2. Ibid., p. 19.

disciples who had received their commission from Christ. As for the sending of Barnabas to confirm their work, Paul was also sent to Macedonia; so that argues nothing. The apostles' words you may all prophesy were addressed to the Corinthian prophets who were extraordinarily inspired to utter revelation and give doctrine, which powers have long ceased in the Christian church. Prophesy "was not a gift residing in the mind by way of habit, but it was an impression transiently made upon the mind by the Holy Ghost, like lightning in the ayre."[1] Do those who call themselves prophets in these times profess an immediate revelation from God; has not the word been given, and is he not accursed if he adds to the word?[2]

In A Modest plea for private men's preaching (1648), John Knowles, "a Preacher of the Gospel, formerly in and neer Glocester, now belonging to the Life-Guard of his Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax," endeavors to vindicate both the truth and himself[3] against the accusations of Mr. Giles Workman. Stating their controversy as whether men gifted for Preaching, though out of office, may lawfully in any company preach the Gospel, Knowles defines preaching as the publishing or declaring of the glad tidings, gifted men as those who had the necessary abilities to preach (Rom. 10:15) and out of office as neither extraordinary church (as were the apostles) nor ordinary church officers (as are pastors and teachers). To prove "that men who know the Gospel and are able to declare it, may . . . as such (being neither Pastors nor Teachers in visible Churches) make known in any company the mysteries of the Gospel

1. Woodbridge, Church-members Set In Joynt, p. 27.
2. Ibid., pp. 30-31.
3. John Knowles, A Modest plea for private men's preaching . . . (8 lines), (London), 1648, "Preface."

revealed to them," Knowles draws testimonies from the Scriptures, "that just desider of all controversies, and discoverer of all doctrines:"[1] (1) Those who enjoy gifts "lie under a divine command to use them" (Luke 19:23, I Peter 4:10-11, Rom. 14:19, I Thes. 5:10, Heb. 10:25); (2) those who have gifts ought to increase them, for gifts are not complete at first but by degrees grow to perfection; (3) the gifts are not given to a man only for his enjoyment but for the use he can make of them to the benefit of others and for the glory of God (I Peter 4:10); (4) nowhere in the Scriptures is the preaching of men out of office condemned; there are many instances in the Scriptures of men out of office using their gifts in gospel preaching as we understand that the Jews freely allowed men who were not their church officers to teach and preach publicly among them (Acts 13:14-15) and the primitive Christians followed this example in hearing all who would reveal the mysteries of the gospel and encouraging all who would preach both to the world and to their brethren (Acts 8:4); (5) good effects do naturally flow from the use of private men's gifts; the Scriptures inform us of such benefits both to the church and to the world (Acts 11:21, I Cor. 14:3, 24-25); (6) the denial of the use of private men's gifts in preaching the gospel brings bad consequences: (a) the denial of men's proving their fitness for office, (b) the hearing of the gospel would be narrowed to those who could prove themselves lawful church officers, not descended from Rome; (c) the Saints would be restrained from enjoying the preaching of the gospel where there is no established church or when the church officers through sickness or persecution be absent from them.[2] Dr. Ames says that it is the duty of all Christians to promote the kingdom

1. Knowles, A modest plea, pp. 3-4.
2. Ibid., pp. 5-9.

of God as much as they can and sometimes in periods of corruption or persecution it becomes necessary for private men to teach and preach lest the faith be lost; Mr. Thomas Goodwin and Mr. Nye write, "'Wee humbly conceive Prophesying (as the Scripture tearmes) or speaking in edification of the whole church may (sometime) be performed by brothren gifted, though not in office as the Elders.'"[1] Should preaching divinity be more restricted than writing divinity; yet Mr. Prynne, a lawyer, and Doctor Bastwicke, a physician, are busy writing in matters of religion. As for men out of office being fitted for gospel preaching, Knowles answers that God's spirit breaths where it will and "is not cloyster'd up amongst the cleargy;" if tongues and arts be considered necessary to fit men for preaching then many private men will be found fit, for in learning many of the laity will not come a step behind the clergy. As for preaching officers becoming useless, if all gifted for preaching may be preachers, Knowles replies that there is a mutual agreement among the ordinances of Christ, "the one not jarring with, or shouldring out another;" the Saints in primitive times and now "esteeme Preaching-church-officers to be needfull, notwithstanding the private Preachers."[2] As for the preaching of private men violating the apostle's precept of everyman's abiding in the calling wherein he was called, Knowles says that the apostle was speaking of believing husbands remaining with unbelieving wives, etc.; did the disciples sin in leaving their first callings and following Christ; are we to assume that all the early Christians who preached during the persecution departed from their trades? (Acts 8:4); did Paul cease preaching because he worked with his hands in making tents? (Acts 18:3). Many private men who preach continue to live by their callings and therefore have not left them.[3]

1. Knowles, A modest plea, pp. 9-10.
2. Ibid., p. 11.
3. Ibid., pp. 13-17.

CHAPTER SEVEN

LAY-PREACHING DEBATED AND DEFENDED DURING THE COMMONWEALTH (1649-1652)

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMONWEALTH
   - A. Nature of the new government
   - B. A guarded toleration
   - C. Cromwell in Scotland
   - D. The English occupation of Scotland

II. THE DEBATE ON LAY-PREACHING RESUMED (1651-1652)
   - A. Thomas Hall
   - B. Thomas Collier
   - C. William Hartley
   - D. John Collinges
   - E. Donald Lupton

III. THE DEBATE CONTINUED
   - A. William Sheppard
   - B. John Collinges
   - C. Francis Fullwood
   - D. John Ferriby
   - E. Robert Boreman
   - F. William Lyford

On May 19, 1649, England was declared a Commonwealth which was to be governed

> by the supreme authority of this nation, the representatives of the people in Parliament, and by such as they shall appoint and constitute as officers and ministers under them for the good of the people, and that without any King or House of Lords.[1]

However, with less than ninety of its former four hundred and ninety members, the House was far from being representative of the nation; yet "the Rump" continued its sitting by the power of the army and by "the superstitious reverence which Englishmen paid even to the shadow of a Parliament."[2] While this "republicanism" was something akin to the "rule of preaching colonels," Trevelyan says,

> for many years to come, the men, and in particular the man, who had seized power through means of the Army but in the name of an unconscious and bewildered 'people of England,' had the courage and genius to govern, making out of an utterly impossible situation something not ignoble, and in some important respects very profitable for the future growth of Great Britain and its Empire.[3]

Even to such a man as Oliver Cromwell, the future of England must have looked dark and uncertain during the early months of 1649. The execution of the king had profoundly shocked most Englishmen and had created abroad a violent hostility to the new government.[4] Many of the Presbyterian ministers denounced the regicides, called the Commonwealth "an heretical democracy" and refused to promise to be faithful to the Parliament; with strong support in London and in the middle class throughout the country, they could have been a serious threat, but a mutual distrust prevented any alliance with the royalists.

1. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 388.
2. Firth, Cromwell, pp. 235-236.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 419.
4. Vide Firth, Cromwell, pp. 238-239. Tanner, op. cit., p. 158.

The first test of strength for the new government came from the radicals within the army, which by 1649 had developed into two distinct groups: (1) the political Levellers or Democrats who wanted manhood suffrage, annual Parliaments and complete religious liberty and (2) the social Levellers or Diggers who wanted "a socialistic republic in which there would be no private property in land, no buying or selling, and neither rich nor poor."[1] The Diggers, led by Gerrard Winstanley, began digging up the enclosed commons and waste land, saying: "'Unless we that are poor have some part of the land to live upon freely as well as the gentry, it cannot be a free Commonwealth;'"[2] their following was not great, and the movement was easily suppressed. Under the leadership of "Freeborn John" Lilburne, the political Levellers were more difficult to suppress; Lilburne's pamphlet Englands New Chains Discovered (Feb. 1649) "marked the opening of a campaign by the Levellers to win control of the revolution by pressure upon the House of Commons and mutiny in the army."[3] Haller and Davies say that this pamphlet

> stigmatized the new regime as a usurpation by the military, designed not to redress the grievances or recover the rights of the people but to secure to themselves the wealth and power which the people's struggle for liberty had given them opportunity to seize.[4]

Other pamphlets followed, denouncing the rule of force and calling for a new Parliament, elected by the people; the House of Commons denounced these

1. Firth, Cromwell, p. 244.
2. Ut per Firth, Cromwell, p. 244. Masson is hardly fair when he describes them as "a poor company of half-crazed men, who had gone out with a retired Army-man as their Prophet, to live on the Surrey hills, planting roots and beans, inviting all the world to join them, and preaching the community of goods and the iniquity of park-palings." Masson, op. cit., vol. IV, pp. 47-48.
3. The Leveller Tracts (1647-1653), ed., William Haller and Godfrey Davies (Columbia University Press, 1944), "Introduction," 19.
4. Ibid.

as "highly seditious and destructive to the present Government."[1] Lilburne, Walwyn, Overton and Thomas Prince were examined and imprisoned, but they continued to exert tremendous influence. On April 2nd, William Kiffin led a deputation of Baptist ministers to Commons and openly disowned the Levellers and renounced all association with them. Within a few weeks, mutiny broke out in the army, but Fairfax and Cromwell, with a few thousand men and a few shots, settled with the rebels and crushed the insurrection.[2] With these failures in the army and "the defection of the sects and congregations," the Levellers' hopes were doomed;[3] however, when "Freeborn John" Lilburne was brought to trial (Act. 1649), the jury acquitted him to the shouts of the people. Later he was banished by a special Act of Parliament, but he returned the next year to declare the Act unconstitutional, and was again acquitted (1653) amid such rejoicing that the very soldiers who were assembled to prevent disorder blew their trumpets and beat their drums; Trevelyan writes:

> That Lilburne could make Cromwell look ridiculous was due to the illogical position of the usurpers. When in the name of the people they had seized power, they found not only the active champions of democracy, but the people itself—whatever definition be given to that term—bitterly hostile to their rule. Yet they could not retire from the false position. Their enemies were still so divided among themselves that the fall of the Regicides would have been followed, not by a Restoration, not by Parliamentary Government, but by a state of anarchy that would have destroyed all political landmarks. It might have ended in economic and social chaos from which feudalism itself might have reared its head. But England was held together by force, till after twelve years her factions and her people were all agreed to accept one particular form of free Government.[4]

Failing to win the Presbyterians by offering to consent to the establishment of their system if they would grant a toleration to all men who

1. Ut per Haller & Davies, op. cit., pp. 20-21.
2. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. IV, pp. 49-51.
3. Haller & Davies, op. cit., p. 29.
4. Trevelyan, Stuarts, pp. 243-244.

"walked peaceably,"[1] Cromwell found that toleration could only be maintained by the sword he held in his hand and that anarchy and disruption could only be prevented by its use. After using it cruelly in Ireland, Cromwell vainly hoped that the Irish would be converted to Protestantism by "assiduous preaching together with humanity, good life, equal and honest dealing with men of different opinion," however, there was no "liberty to exercise the mass," and priests were hunted down and exiled so that the very struggle indetified Irish nationalism with Catholicism.[2]

Cromwell's sword was used more temperately in Scotland and more "assiduous preaching" was done there than in Ireland. The day after the news of the king's execution reached Edinburgh, Charles II was proclaimed king of Great Britain; after Montrose's defeat, Charles was forced to take the Covenant to secure the support of the church and army. As Commander-in-Chief of the Commonwealth forces, Cromwell tried to persuade the Kirk party that its well-being was involved "in the common fate of Puritanism in Great Britain,"[3] but his old comrade, David Leslie, out maneuvered him so that by the end of August (1650) he, with a "poor, shattered, discouraged army," had to fall back on Dunbar.[4] Having penned the "army of heretics and blasphemers" against the sea, Leslie made an error in moving his army down from the Doon hill in preparation for an attack; Cromwell saw his chance and before dawn attacked. As the sun rose out of the sea, Cromwell shouted, "Let God arise, let His enemies be scattered;" by six o'clock the battle was over and Cromwell halted his men to sing the 117th Psalm.[5] In his report of the battle, Cromwell wrote:

1. Vide Firth, Cromwell, pp. 250-251.
2. Ibid., pp. 255-257.
3. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 247.
4. Firth, Cromwell, pp. 280-281.
5. Vide Buchan, Cromwell, pp. 378-379.

> It would do you good to see and hear our poor foot to go up and down making their boast of God. But, Sir, it's in your hands, and by these eminent mercies God puts it more into your hands, To give glory to Him; to improve your power, and His blessings, to His praise. We that serve you beg of you not to own us,—but God alone. We pray you own His people more and more; for they are the chariots and horsemen of Israel. Disown yourselves;—but own your Authority; and improve it to curb the proud and the insolent, such as would disturb the tranquillity of England, though under what specious pretences soever.[1]

Cromwell occupied Edinburgh without any difficulty, but the castle, where most of the clergy of Edinburgh had taken refuge, held out against him. Observing that the poor people of Edinburgh were "sadly short of Sermon" on Sunday (Sept. 8, 1650), Cromwell had Whalley address a letter to the governor of the castle, in which "free liberty" to preach was promised to the clergymen. The ministers replied that they could not trust his word as the ministers were persecuted in England and since he had unjustly invaded their country; they were resolved "to reserve themselves for better times, and to wait upon Him who hath hidden His face for a while from the sons of Jacob."[2] Cromwell replied (9th Sept.) that no man was troubled in England for preaching the gospel nor had any minister been molested in Scotland since the army had come; he reminded them of the danger of trying to accomplish a glorious Reformation by getting mixed up in worldly designs and asked them if the Lord's Hand had not witnessed against them. The ministers replied that ministers of the Covenant in England had been forced to flee and that "men of mere Civil place, and employment" had usurped the calling and employment of the Ministry to the scandal of the Reformed Kirks; they added that "they have not so learned Christ as to hang the equity of their Cause upon events."[3] In his reply of September

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol. III, pp. 45-46.
2. Ibid., p. 58.
3. Ibid., pp. 61-62.

12, 1650, Cromwell asked if any had denied their fellow Christians liberty more than the very up-holders of the Covenant who had assumed the infallible Chair and denounced those who differ with their pronouncements as Sectaries; "we look at Ministers as helpers of, not lords over, God's people." As for those men of civil employments who "usurp the calling and employment of the Ministry," Cromwell wrote:

> Are you troubled that Christ is preached? Is preaching so exclusively your function? Doth it scandalise the Reformed Kirks, and Scotland in particular? Is it against the Covenant? Away with the Covenant, if this be so! I thought, the Covenant and these 'professors of it' could have been willing that any should speak good of the name of Christ: if not, it is no Covenant of God's approving; nor are these Kirks you mention insomuch the Spouse of Christ. Where do you find in the Scripture a ground to warrant such an assertion, That Preaching is exclusively your function? Though an Approbation from men hath order in it, and may do well; yet he that hath no better warrant than that, hath none at all. I hope He that ascended up on high may give His gifts to whom He pleases: and if those gifts be the seal of Mission, be not 'you' envious though Eldad and Medad prophesy. You know who bids us <u>covet earnestly the best gifts</u>, but chiefly <u>that we may prophesy</u>; which the Apostle explains there to be a speaking to instruction and edification and comfort,--which speaking, the instructed, the edified and comforted can best tell the energy and effect of, 'and say whether it is genuine.' If such evidence be, I say again, Take heed you envy not for your own sakes; lest you be guilty of a greater fault than Moses reproved in Joshua for envying for his sake.
>
> Indeed, you err through mistaking of the Scriptures. Approbation is an act of conveniency in respect of order; not of necessity, to give faculty to preach the Gospel. Your pretended fear lest Error should step in, is like the man who would keep all the wine out the country lest men should be drunk. It will be found an unjust and unwise jealousy, to deprive a man of his natural liberty upon a supposition he may abuse it. When he doth abuse it, judge. If a man speak foolishly, ye suffer him gladly because ye are wise; if erroneously, the truth more appears by your conviction 'of him.' Stop such a man's mouth by sound words which cannot be gainsaid. If he speak blasphemously, or to the disturbance of the public peace, let the Civil Magistrate punish him: if truly, rejoice in the truth. And if you will call our speakings together since we came into Scotland,—to provoke one another to love and good works, to faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and repentance from dead works; 'and' to charity and love towards you, to pray and mourn for you, and for your bitter returns to 'our love of you,' and your incredulity of our professions of love to you, of the truth of which we have made our solemn and humble appeals to the Lord our God, which He hath heard and borne witness to: if you will call 'these' things scandalous to the Kirk, and against the Covenant, because done by men of Civil callings,—we rejoice in them,

notwithstanding what you say.[1]

Cromwell was also watchful over the attitude and concept of preaching held among his own troops; in a letter (December 25, 1650), Cromwell reprimands Colonel Hacker for a derogatory statement he made concerning one of the preaching officers.

> . . . I was not satisfied with your last speech to me about Empson, That he was a better preacher than fighter or soldier,--or words to that effect. Truly I think he that prays and preaches best will fight best. I know nothing 'that' will give like courage and confidence as the knowledge of God in Christ will; and I bless God to see any in this Army able and willing to impart the knowledge they have, for the good of others. And I expect it be encouraged, by all the Chief Officers in this Army especially; and I hope you will do so. I pray receive Captain Empson lovingly; I dare assure you he is a good man and a good officer; I would we had no worse.[2]

Baillie did not agree with such an opinion; writing from Perth on January 7, 1651, he encourages the Edinburgh clergy to withstand Cromwell:

> . . . we earnestlie exhort yow, . . . to avoid all familiar conversing with these seducers; but above all, that you beware to joyne with them in publick worship, or in any private exercise of religion: Who ventures to touch pitch will be defyled before they be aware;. . . beware of the wyles and subtile deeps of the Devill; and, among all his instruments, we intreat yow to avoid none more than these miserable apostates of our own nation.[3]

However, Cromwell was a man they could not avoid, and as Glasgow had no castle in which they could hide, the clergy there soon had familiar converse with him. On April 22, 1651, Baillie writes:

> For preventing of mistakes, we have thought meet to advertise yow, that Cromwell, haveing come to Hamiltone on Fryday late, and to Glasgow on Saturday, with a body of his armie, sooner than with safety we could weell have retired ourselves; on Sunday before noone, he came unexpectedlie to the High Inner Church, where quietlie he heard Mr. Robert Ramsay preach a very good honest sermon, pertinent for his case. In the afternoon, he came als unexpectedlie to the High Outer Kirk, where he heard Mr. John Carstairs lecture, and Mr. James Durhame preach, graciouslie and weell to the times as could have been desyred. Gener-

1. Cromwell's Letters, vol. III, pp. 65-66.
2. Ibid., p. 104.
3. Baillie, Letters, vol. III, p. 130.

> allie all who preached that day in the Towne gave a fair enough testimonie against the Sectaries.[1]

After some of the army had failed to get the ministers to confer with their general, a messenger came from Cromwell himself requesting such a conference, and the ministers agreed to go and "hear what would be said."

> When we came, he spoke long and smoothlie, shewing the scandale himselffe and others had taken at the doctrine they had heard preached; especiallie that they were condemned, 1st, As unjust invaders: 2. As contemners and tramplers under foot of the ordinances: 3. As persecutors of the ministers of Ireland: That as they were unwilling to offend us by a publick contradicting of us in the Church, so they expected we would be willing to give them a reason when they craved it in private. We shew our willingness to give a reason either for these three, or what else was excepted against in any of our sermons. . . . Let the Lord make of this what he will: we had no mind to beginne, and have no pleasure to continue, any conference with any of these men; but all of us conceave it was unavoidable, without a greater scandale, to do what we have done. . . .[2]

However, among the devout clergy there came a great searching of heart, and a schism resulted; Gillespie and Guthry led the Remonstrants who repudiated "the idea of fighting for Charles II. till he had proved his fitness to be a covenanted king," while the Resolutioners, "laxer in its moral views, and moved more by national than religious feeling, was ready to accept the compromises which the necessities of the State demanded."[3] Despite these disappointments, Charles II still had hopes of entering England with a Scottish army and receiving help from a general royalist rising which would seat him on his father's throne. Cromwell found Leslie's army posted on the hills south of Stirling; and failing to dislodge Leslie from his position, Cromwell marched on Perth, thereby cutting Leslie's supply line from the North but at the same time leaving the way to England open. Charles took his chance; through Carlisle and Lancashire,

1. Baillie, Letters, vol. III, pp. 165-166.
2. Ibid.
3. Firth, Cromwell, pp. 286-287.

along the Welsh border he marched with his Scottish troopers, but the people were reluctant to join him. At Worcester the net quickly closed around him; dividing his superior numbers in half, Cromwell attacked from both east and west; and on Sept. 3, 1651 the last royalist revolt ended.

When the Scots came to know the Sectarian soldiers, they were rather surprised to find that they were not as bad as they had expected; Masson says that while the clergy continued their pulipt mutterings against the "sectaries and blasphemers," many important laymen came to think better of Cromwell and his officers.[1] In A History of His Own Times, Bishop Burnet says:

> I remember well of three regiments coming to Aberdeen. There was an order and discipline, and a face of gravity and piety among them, that amazed all people. Most of them were Independents and Anabaptists; They were all gifted men, and preached as they were moved. But they never disturbed the publick assemblies in the churches but once. They came and reproached the preachers for laying things to their charge that were false. I was then present: The debate grew very fierce: At last they drew their swords: But there was no hurt done: Yet Cromwell displeaced the governor for not punishing this.[2]

Burnet says that while Cromwell's men were in the Highlands they were so careful in their discipline, kept such good order in punishing vice and brought so much money into those parts that the people there "always reckon those eight years of usurpation a time of great peace and prosperity."[3] Baillie tries to present a darker picture; writing toward the close of 1655 he says that while all Scotland was exceedingly quiet, it was in "a very uncomfortable condition" with many of the nobility wrecked, the towns lacking in trade and the country as a whole lacking justice.[4] However in September of 1656, he confesses that Glasgow had "more than

1. Masson, op. cit., pp. 280-281.
2. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, p. 58.
3. Ibid., p. 61.
4. Baillie, Letters, vol. III, p. 288.

doubled in our tyme" and that "the word of God is well loved and regarded" there; while he bemoans the presence of the sectarians, he says surprisingly little about the soldiers' preaching.[1] In fact, Firth says that after 1648 less is heard of the soldiers' preaching and suggests, as possible reasons, that such was no longer a novelty, that it had become useless to complain and that an increase in the number of army chaplains had made "amateur preachers less necessary."[2] When the breach between the army and Parliament came in June 1647, one fourth of the army leaders (167) left the army and their places were taken by men of Independent convictions; Firth says that "with this secession the dominion of Independency in the army was assured."[3] About 1648, a considerable number of chaplains were "voted" into the army, and it seems that the old system of regimental chaplains was re-established.[4] Nevertheless, soldiers and officers continued to share in religious exercises; we are told that on July 11, 1649 when Cromwell set out for Ireland, "three ministers did pray and the Lord Lieutenant himself and Colonel Goffe and Colonel Harrison did expound some places of Scripture excellently well and pertinent to the occasion."[5] In his Diary, Nicoll tells that in 1651 Major-General Lambert demanded the use of the East Kirk in Edinburgh for the use of his soldiers and that not only did Independent ministers preach there, but captains, lieutenants and even troopers delivered sermons.

> 'When they entered the pulpits,' Nicoll writes, 'they did not observe our Scottish forms, but when they ascended they entered the pulpits with their swords hung at their sides, and some carrying pistols up with them, and after their entry, laid aside within the

1. Baillie, Letters, vol. III, pp. 319-328.
2. Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 337.
3. Ibid., p. 320.
4. Ibid., p. 324.
5. Whitelocke, Memorials of the English Affairs (new ed., London: printed for J. Tonson, 1732), 66.

pulpit their swords till they ended their sermons.'[1]

In his Memorials, Whitelocke makes this entry, December 1651:

> Letters that two Troops of Colonel Whaley's Regiment quartered at Nottingham, had Meetings twice a Week, where their Officers, and some of their Soldiers did preach and pray; for which they were hated and cursed by the Presbyterians and their Preachers, who say, They are the greatest Plague that ever did befal that Town.[2]

It will be remembered that Sir Walter Scott opens his novel Woodstock with an account of a soldier's interrupting the service in Woodstock parish church; Scott says, "Scenes of this indecent kind were so common at that time that no one thought of interfering."[3] However, while there were some incidents of rude interruption of religious services, their number seems to have been exaggerated; under Cromwell freedom of preaching was upheld, but he did not countenance the disturbance of any religious meeting.

Firth describes the church in England at this time as "a chaos of isolated congregations, in which a man made himself a minister as he chose, and got himself a living as he could;" Parliament hesitated to undertake the difficult task of reducing this chaos to order, as so many controversial questions were still unsettled.[4] One of these questions was of the right of laymen to preach, and although the House was reluctant to deal with it, the debaters of this issue were not silent; only the question of tithes rivaled it in the number of publications which came from the press during the years 1651-1653. One of the most important of these was Thomas Hall's The Pulpit Guarded, which was printed for E. Blackmore in 1651; this publication was occasioned by a dispute which its author had

1. Ut per Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 338.
2. Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 516.
3. Sir Walter Scott, Woodstock or The Cavalier (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd.), 6-7.
4. Firth, Cromwell, pp. 305-306.

at Henly in Warwickshire (Aug. 20, 1650) against a group of tradesmen who had fallen into "the way of Anabaptists" and upheld the principle that all gifted brethren might preach. After stating his thesis "That Private persons (though they be gifted, yet) may not Preach in a constituted Church without a Call" and defining his terms, Hall begins his arguments with the following syllogism:

> 1. If God were angry with those in the time of the law that did usurp the Priests office, then (he being JEHOVAH, the same for ever) will be angry with those in the time of the Gospel that do usurp the Ministers office.
>
> But God was angry with those in the time of the Law that did usurp the Priests office:
>
> Ergo, He will be angry with those in the Gospel that do usurp the Ministers office.[1]

Hall proves the major by citing the immutability of God's nature (Heb. 13:8); the minor he proves by induction: (1) the Lord smote Uzzah dead for meddling with the Ark (II Sam. 6:6-7) and Uzziah the king with leprosy for presuming to burn incense in the temple (II Chron. 26:16-20); Hall tells us that when he had made this argument at Henly he called on the "Naylor" to answer, but he was "as dumb and deaf as a door-nayl;" one T. P. cried out, No Syllogisms, to which Hall replied that logic was nothing but reason brought into method and form and one could not do without it in an argument.[2] Hall's second argument:

> If none may preach but such as are sent, then every Gifted Brother may not preach.
>
> But none may preach but such as are sent (Rom. 10:15, Jer. 14:14).
>
> Ergo, every Gifted brother may not preach.

To this argument his opponent said not a word; Hall writes,

> The brightness of this truth shone so strongly in his face, that he was fain to Face about, and desire of the Reverned Moderator [Mr. Jo. Trap], that he might first urge his own Arguments, and I should

1. Thomas Hall, The Pulpit Guarded, . . . (30 lines), (London: by J. Cottrel, for E. Blackmore), 1651, p. 7.
2. Ibid., p. 9.

> have liberty to urge mine after; which being granted him, è postico descedit, having finish'd his own Arguments, he never staid to hear mine, but left his followers (of which he had more then a good many) to shift for themselves, &c.
>
> Goliah being non-plust, vanquisht and fled, I set upon the multitude, and with the following Argument Routed them all.
>
> If all that have gifts may Preach, then all that have gifts may Baptize.
>
> But all that have gifts (say you) may Preach.
>
> Ergo, all that have gifts may Baptize.
>
> Here the gifted Brethren (for I know not what else to call them: should I call them Lay-preachers, it may be, 'twould be offensive:) denyed the sequel of the Major: For though private persons might preach as gifted men, yet none might Baptize but officers. . . . To this I replyed thus:
>
> What Christ hath joyned together, none may separate.
>
> But Christ hath joyned Preaching and Baptizing. Matth. 28.19. Therefore none may separate them. He that hath the power of Preaching, to him Christ hath given the power of Baptizing. . . .[1]

It seems that with this argument the meeting was interrupted and disbanded because Hall speaks of his other arguments as those which he could not "prosecute in publike for want of time and by reason of Tumult;"[2] we may condense these into briefer form. (4) As no priest or prophet could offer sacrifice without a call (Ex. 28:1), so none may preach or deliver the sacraments without a call. (5) If gifts alone were sufficient for an office, all kinds of absurdities would follow to the utter confusion of all callings and society. (6) A preacher must be able to divide the word aright (II Tim. 2:15), to interpret it soundly, to apply it to edification and to convince gain-sayers (Titus 1:9), which tradesmen are not able to do.[3] (7) Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin (Heb. 11:6); whatsoever we do without some command or call is not of faith therefore, since our gifted brothers have no call or command it is sinful for them to preach.[4] (8) If none may preach but such as be ordained, then every gifted person

1. Hall, The Pulpit Guarded, pp. 13-14.
2. Ibid., p. 14.
3. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
4. Ibid., p. 21.

may not preach; to be able to preach one must be ordained (Titus 1:5). Elders were set up in the churches (Acts 13:23), and through them the office was to continue until the coming of Christ (I Tim. 6:12-14). (9) If no man may be an inferior church officer without a call and ordination from the church (Acts 6:2-6), then no man is able to be a preacher or a superior church officer without a call and ordination.[1] (10) Every man should study to be quiet (I Thes. 4:11), to do his own work (I Peter 4:15) and keep the bounds of his proper calling; therefore private men should not try to be pulpit-men.

> Let the Naylor keep to his Hammer, the Husbandman to his Plough, the Taylor to his Shears, the Baker to his Kneading-trough, the Milner to his Toll, the Tanner to his Hides, and the Souldier to his Arms, &c. They must not leap from the Shop to the Pulpit from the Army to the Ministery, from the Blue Apron to the Black Gown, &c. But if ever men would have comfort, let them keep the bounds and limits of their particular Callings. God hath set every Calling its bounds, which none may pass. Superiours must govern; Inferiours obey and be Governed: Ministers must studie and preach; People must hear and obey,&c. As in an Army, the General appoints every man his place and station; one in the Front, another in the Rere, &c. there he must abide against the enemy; there he must live and die: so 'tis in Humane Societies; the great Lord General hath appointed to every man his particular Calling, and in doing it he must live and die. I Cor. 7.20.[2]

Paul's double calling cannot serve as a pattern, because he was an apostle, having an extraordinary measure of the spirit. (11) The promise of assistance (Matt. 28:20) was made to the apostles and their successors; private persons have no claim to this promise and therefore cannot "comfortably or successfully undertake a work." (12) The toleration of private persons' preaching breeds disorder, error and confusion and therefore it cannot be the way of God who loves order and peace.[3] (13) If the church be God's house and family, then no man may presume to exercise any

1. Hall, The Pulpit Guarded, p. 22.
2. Ibid., p. 23.
3. Ibid., p. 26.

function there, without a call from God. (14) That which springs from pride and self-conceitedness cannot be good; the usurpation of another man's office comes from pride and results in confusion, and therefore must be evil. (15) At His ascension, Christ did not make all gifted men to be pastors and teachers, but only those whom he had called (Ephes. 4:11, I Cor. 22:28-29, Matt. 10:42). (16) The preaching of gifted men without a call has no precept or precedent in the Bible, and therefore must not be tolerated in the church of God. (17) All of the reformed churches condemn the practice of private mens' preaching without a call, and therefore should not be tolerated by any (I Cor. 11:16).[1] As for the practice of the Jewish church to admit all gifted artificers to preach, Hall says "this corrupt and irregular practice, can be no president to us, who are to walk by Rule, and the Canon of the Word, and not by such disordered examples."[2] The preaching of Christ cannot be an example for the imitation of laymen as none can live His life or perform His miracles; the apostles were not "Lay-Preachers," for they had their call from Christ and to them was committed the keeping of the keys. Stephen's words were only "an Apologetical oration for himself, and a confession of the Faith before his persecutors;" Philip had a special commission from the Spirit, and whatever the work of the house of Stephanas was, they were lawfully called to it and did give themselves freely to it. To the objection that Apollos was ordained later than his preaching in Acts 18:24 ff., Hall answers "where the Scripture hath not a Tongue to speak, we must have no ears to hear."[3] The apostle's exhortation (I Cor. 14:1, 31) does not include all the saints, for women are forbidden to prophesy and nowhere are private

1. Hall, The Pulpit Guarded, pp. 27-28.
2. Ibid., pp. 46-47.
3. Ibid., pp. 52-53.

professors commanded to leave their callings and study the arts and sciences that they might become preachers; the apostle means only all who are prophets, men in office or extraordinarily called and gifted, were to instruct the Church of God. The term prophet is used in the Old Testament only for a minister or a man in office; our Savior Himself distinguishes between a prophet and a righteous man (matt. 10:41). Of the royal priesthood of believers (I Peter 2:9), Hall says there are two kinds; first the priests by office who were to offer sacrifice and to teach the people and secondly all believers who reign over sin and have the spirit of God to teach others the way of the Lord "privately according to their places and stations."[1] After conducting a "trial of the lay-prophet" and finding him guilty of bringing disorder and confusion into the Church of God, Hall sentences him to perpetual silence.[2]

Thomas Collier lost no time in answering Mr. Hall, whom he accuses of leaving his calling to become a soldier to guard the pulpit for the pope or the devil; in the preface to The Pulpit-Guard Routed (1651), Collier says that such a thing as a pulpit-guard is nowhere to be found in Scripture and is contrary to the spirit of Christ who would not forbid any from doing good in his name (Mark 9:38-39).[3] He endeavors to rout Hall's arguments with the following answers: (1) As for the judgments pronounced upon those who usurped the priestly office, Collier says that Christ has fulfilled the priestly office and that whereas Uzzah was punished for doing what was forbidden, Hall would smite the saints for doing what they are commanded to do. Gifted men are not the only ones with faults; Collier reminds

1. Hall, The Pulpit Guarded, pp. 54-55.
2. Ibid., pp. 28-30.
3. Thomas Collier, The Pulpit-Guard Routed, . . . (23 lines), 2nd ed. (London: for the author), 1652.

Mr. Hall of two "zealous preachers of your tribe" who were ousted by the Committee because one got his servant with child and the other the daughter of his nearest friend.[1] (2) As for the sending, every gifted brother is sent to preaching according to the measure of the gift received and the opportunity he has to use it; a gospel-prophet receives a call by the "internal power of the Spirit." By Hall's definition of sending, the prophesying in the Corinth Church was unlawful, as that was an established church; by his requirement the apostles could not be ministers, as they were unlearned men (Acts 4:13). As for the Presbytery sending, Collier asks if the very name Presbytery is not a new title; "alas, you were ignorant of Presbyterie your selves not long since!"[2] (3) Collier grants that gifted men may baptize as well as preach "when time, opportunity and liberty cals for it; only the brother doth it according to his gift as a member; the other waiting on his office, as one intrusted by the Church more than ordinary for that end." It is likely that the scattered brethren baptized as well as preached and that some gifted brethren assisted in baptizing the three thousand.[3] (4) Collier rejects the comparison of the priest under the law with the preacher under the gospel; the sacrifice has been made by Christ the high priest, and now all the saints are a spiritual and holy priesthood, with the obligation to proclaim the gospel according to their ability.[4] (5) The apostle gives order for the gospel ordinance of gifted men's preaching, and the ministers, fearing to be made equal with the brethren, have magnified and frightened the people with imagined evils; if the ministers walk according to the truth and with

1. Collier, The Pulpit-Guard Routed, pp. 17-19.
2. Ibid., pp. 20-25.
3. Ibid., pp. 28-30.
4. Ibid., pp. 31-34.

humility, then the people will love and honor them as ministers of Christ.[1] (6) Human knowledge of languages and learning may be a valuable help, but in no sense are they to surpass the divine knowledge which can come to illiterate tradesmen by the gift of God; as for Paul's using Greek, Latin and Hebrew, Collier says that these were the languages of his day.[2] (7) As gifted brethren have a word of faith and a call, it is not sin for them to preach; it is sin if they do not preach. (8) Ordination originally was that "the Gift might first be increased upon them (I Tim. 4.14.) and secondly that they might attend upon the work of watching, feeding, reproving, ruling, &c." It was not purposed to exclude men from preaching, for Paul preached before he was ordained and unless men preach before ordination there can be no grounds for ordination.[3] (9) It is granted that no man might be a church officer without ordination, but preaching is not a trade to be monopolized by the "Merchants of Babylon." (10) May not the ploughman study to be quiet and yet speak out boldly for his Lord; the servant is told not to leave his master, but that does not mean he must not witness of his Lord to his earthly master. Paul had a double calling and worked with his hands that he might not burden others; if he labored to set an example of industry, why do the ministers not follow it? If a minister may teach school and preach, might not "a Lay-Prophet" bake and preach, nail and preach as well as fish and preach or make tents and preach?[4] (11) It is granted that the ministry is a distinct calling, but that does not prevent gifted brethren from preaching; it is the power and grace of Christ that remits sins and not the word of a priest, however related to the pope. (12) Every gifted brother is <u>not</u> fit to be a minister

1. Collier, <u>The Pulpit-Guard Routed</u>, pp. 34-37.
2. <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 37-42.
3. <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 43-44.
4. <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 45-46.

in office, yet every gifted brother is fit to communicate according to the gift he has received; Paul and Peter encouraged the Saints to perform their duty (I Cor. 14, I Peter 4), and if our ministers were true servants of Christ, they would also.[1] (13) As for "this tolleration of all gifted brethren to preach" being first invented by the Socinians, Anabaptists, etc., Collier replies that the Lord Jesus and his apostles did first invent this practice. (14) As for the argument that private persons can expect no divine assistance, Collier asks where are the saints called private-persons or "Lay-men in the Scriptures;" the promise of our Lord to be with those who obey him is applicable to those who exercise the gifts which God has given them (I Peter 4:14).[2] (15) As for the error and confusion, Collier accuses his opponents for stirring up the persecutions and wars; "you it is in all Ages that have been the cause of War and Blood; and you it is that at present, if mercy prevent not, endeavour to knidle a fire . . . that will devour the nation." (16) The apostle established the order by which all gifted brethren might preach. (17) Who has more pride than the ministers who make a show of their learning and persecute others who speak of Christ outside their monopoly? (18) Christ has set in his church apostles, prophets and teachers—prophets being "gifted brethren, prophesying according to the measure of faith." (19) Psalm 145:11-12 and I Cor. 14:5-6 are cited as precepts for gifted men's preaching, and Collier finds precedents in the prophets of the Old Testament who "acted sutable to the gift" and the preaching of the scattered Christians. (20) The examples of learned divines and of church customs can only be followed in so far as they follow Christ and the Scriptures; as the Scriptures plainly teach that gifted brethren may preach and prophesy (I Cor. 14:31), we must walk

1. Collier, The Pulpit-Guard Routed, p. 47.
2. Ibid., pp. 48-49.

according to that rule.[1] As for Hall's trial of "lay-prophet," Collier asks why Hall had not called "your Mother Church of Rome" and the Spanish Inquistion, as they had used the same arguments and methods to stamp out the gospel ordinance of gifted brethren's preaching; Collier calls for a new trial, produces other witnesses from the Scripture and the Saints, and a different verdict is rendered upon "the Lay-Preachers."[2]

William Hartley also answered The Pulpit Guarded; in The Prerogative Priests Passing-Bell (1651), he says that Hall's animosity to laymen's preaching betrays him as being from Rome, for "in the commonwealth of Saints there is no such distinction of Laity and Clergy, but all are one (or alike) in Jesus Christ." As for the "consecrated priests," Hartley says that there is "scarce one of a hundred who do not as eagerly thrust after the dregs of Prelacy and Tyranny, as Israel did after the Egyptian flesh pots."[3] In the constitution of the Commonwealth of Israel no man was without a civil calling, even Aaron with the Levites had an outward employment or calling which in the scripture sense is termed work (Num. 4); since the Word of God was "indifferently and equally referred and required of all; would God all the people were prophets."[4] Christians are to remain in their marriage and employment and to use their opportunities of witnessing for Christ wherever and under what conditions they are. Are not all who go down in ships to declare the wonders of God in the deep, and are not all people who dwell upon the earth to declare his goodness? "Certainly then no man is disfranchized of his privilege, but rather entailed thereunto by the Light of God and reason." The apostle

1. Collier, The Pulpit-Guard Routed, pp. 50-52.
2. Ibid., pp. 53-58.
3. William Hartley, The Prerogative Priests Passing-Bell . . . (23 lines), (London: by J. M.), 1651, "Preface."
4. Ibid., p. 1.

Paul has provided against any disorder in the church, by saying, "ye may all prophesy one by one;" although all soldiers are commanded to stand guard they do not all stand guard at once but each in his turn.[1] In primitive times ordination was "a confirmation or witness bearing to Truth in persons" by those who heard it and, Hartley argues, this power is "equally centered in all illuminated persons in fellowship of the gospel." David said, I saw; therefore, I spake; as every man sees or experiences, so is he to testify and speak. "Gifts, graces or spiritual experiments of the ways of God, give, and only give the principles of preaching." Declaring that ordination is not a patent or license from a creature for the monopolizing of preaching, Hartley calls upon "all stiled Ministers to this Nation" to

> lay down that Prerogative Honour fetcht from Rome, and lay aside that Popish distinction of Clergy and Laity, becoming all one in Jesus Christ, and rather preach by vertue of Gospel abilities, then humane Letters Pattents.[2]

Denying that they had any communion with the Levellers, Hartley asks why the Word of God should not be preached by any who may be able. To Hall's sarcasm of Lawrence Williams, a nailer-preacher, Hartley replies: "A True Nailer indeed; while thy hands made Nails for mans use, thy mind forgeth Truths, as fit Nails to fasten Christs building." To Hall's ridicule of Tho. Palmer, a baker-preacher, Hartley answers, "well done Baker, Bread for the Body, and Bread for the Soul, thou servest both God and men." Did not Christ allow Peter to fish and to preach? "Therefore trading and preaching is legitimate in the self-same person."[3]

In his Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici (1651), John Collinges

1. Hartley, The Prerogative Priests Passing-Bell, pp. 2-3.
2. Ibid., p. 4.
3. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

expresses the typical Presbyterian attitude of his day in declaring that just as the work of reformation began, the devil mustered up a legion of heretics for a general rendezvous in England, all of which united in a cry for licentious liberty.[1] The devil directed his assembled host against the ministerial function, shouting that the whole world had been cheated with the notion of a ministerial calling and that every Christian is a priest who can preach and administer sacraments.[2] In an age when many are crying for liberty, Collinges says, it is not to be wondered that in addition to State Levellers, there should be a faction of Church Levellers who would make God's enclosures common.[3] Gospel precepts condemn the preaching of private persons (I Titus 5:1, I Tim. 5:22, Acts 13:5) and restricts preaching to those in office (I Cor. 7:20, I Tim. 3:1). The preaching of gifted men would make the office of ministry useless and contrary to Scripture (II Tim. 2:2). Warrant is given for the maintenance of those who preach (II Tim. 5:18, Matt. 10:10), and as all gifted men cannot be so maintained, they must not preach. Men may have legs to run and the desire to go, but they must first be sent; as extraordinary calling and sending have now ceased (Eph. 4:11-12, I Cor. 12:29-30), men can be called and sent only by those instruments which Christ has appointed.[4] The Lord's vineyard surely needs laborers, but it is God's ordinance that his laborers first be sent, that is, by solemnly set apart by fasting, praying and laying on of hands by the Presbytery. The instances generally cited for gifted men's preaching in Scripture are of men extraordinarily inspired and commissioned; extraordinary prophets were not always in-

1. John Collinges, Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici, . . . (27 lines), (London: for Rich. Tomlins), 1651, "Preface," pp. 1-7.
2. Ibid., pp. 8-9.
3. Ibid., p. 25.
4. Vide Ibid., pp. 24-48 for detailed arguments.

fallible, for Samuel called Eliab the Lord's anointed and Elijah thought he only was left in Israel; only as they were guided by the Holy Spirit were the prophets infallible. I Cor. 14:31 means that all who were prophets might prophesy, and I Peter 4:10-11 means that those in office were to be deligent as faithful stewards. Hebrews 3:13 does not necessarily mean public preaching, nor does the word talent of Matt. 25:25-30 mean gift alone for it can mean office. As for Christ's asking questions in the temple as a boy of twelve when the officials could not take him for an officer, Collinges says: "What they took him for is no great matter . . . it was but their sinfull liberty they gave (not acknowledging Christ a Prophet) to permit it."[1] God witnessed against Korah, Dathan and Abiram who sought to usurp the priestly office; has He not also witnessed against the practice of private-men's preaching "by permitting it to be the mother of confusion and division of churches, and of many of those errors, and heresies, and blasphemies for which the Land mournes this day?"[2] God has warned against those whom He has not sent (Jer. 23:32); therefore,

> tell me no more what sweet truths you heare, how much is got by hearing such an exercise, how much you learne, &c. Here's the Word of the Lord against this deceit of your hearts, and your fancy of profiting is but a diabolicall delusion.[3]

While on business in London, Donald Lupton tell us that he heard some "famous Divines" who disappointed him in preaching against the witnessing of gifted men. One of the ministers said that gifts were not to be regarded as they puffed men up; he "made an oppossition betwixt Graces and gifts" which he conceived to be united in himself but thought not

1. Collinges, Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici, pp. 58-63.
2. Ibid., "Preface," pp. 19-20.
3. Ibid., p. 26.

possible to be in others.[1] When Lupton asked a friend why "the Presbyterian Rabbies" preached so violently, he was told

> that there were divers Tradesmen and Artists, in and about London who Preach'd and Teached the word, and yet never were in any University, nor were ever made Ministers by the Assembly of Divines, and such men they could not abide, nor endure that they should have liberty to preach, and that of late they were more countenanced by some great Personages, to the scandal (as they say) of the publike Ministry, and the ruine and destruction of many that hear them, and their Pernicious Doctrines, and to the venting of Sects and damnable Heresies, and (as they would make men believe) to the destruction and confusion of the Church and Common-Wealth.[2]

Offended at such a spirit, Lupton endeavors "to cleer and vindicate such gifted men in their actions of Preaching Gods Word" and presents the following arguments in behalf of "the freedom of preaching:" (1) from the manner of God's bestowing his gifts (Jam. 1:5); He does not give all to one servant and nothing to another. (2) God gives gifts to be used, managed and improved (Matt. 5:15). Who is it that dares to snuff out those whom God has enlightened? Why do "our Rabbies" try to blow out all other candles but their own? God said, Let there be light for all men to enjoy and not for just a few. His gifts are given for the benefit of all; therefore, whosoever has the gift of prophesying, let him use it to the utmost and let the Rabbies heed Gamaliel's counsel. Paul wished that all "beloved of God" in Rome (Rom. 1:7) might prophesy (Rom. 12:6); why may not all "beloved of God" in London do the same?[3] (3) Moses rebuked Joshua for hindering Eldad and Medad from prophesying (Num. 11:28 ff) and Jesus rebuked John for forbidding the man to do good in His name (Mk. 9:38 ff, Luke 9:49). Addressing the London preachers, Lupton asks:

> Can you be justly angry that Christs Gospel is propagated? What is it to you what Instruments God pleaseth to use or Imploy? What if

1. Donald Lupton, The freedom of preaching . . . (12 lines), (London: by R. W.), 1652, p. 1.
2. Ibid., p. 2.
3. Ibid., pp. 4-10.

> it please God to send these out to the Hedges, Highwaies and Lanes (whither your stateliness will not vouchsafe to go) to call in the Halt, the Lame and the Blinde (to whom you will scorn to Preach, or with whom you do disdain to converse) if by this means Gods house be filled, . . . have you any cause of anger for their compassion, Pains and Charity? . . . Are you angry that the Sun of Righteousness shines into these mens shops more then into your Pulpits or Studies? . . . since . . . all are allowed by Moses to Preach, and none forbidden by Christ, who do his work, cease any longer to cry up your selves for the onely men; and let others have liberty to hold out Christ in his word as well as your selves. . . .[1]

(4) It is a great sin for any man to hide his talents (Matt. 25:28-29), with a heavy punishment falling upon him who fails to use the gifts and graces which God has given him; the apostle Paul encourages all able believers to prophesy and tells the others to covet to do likewise.[2] (5) The freedom of preaching was allowed and approved by the apostle Paul; he rejoiced that "many of the brethren in the Lord waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear" (Phil. 1:14-16). (6) The Ark, the Tabernacle, and the Temple (all types of the spiritual House of Christ) were built by men of many trades and crafts; shall now there be none allowed to build the spiritual temple but presbyters—if so, then the work will go but slowly. If in the height of the harvest others, maybe not as capable or gifted as you, should come and volunteer to help with the reaping, is it not an act of ingratitude to rail and revile them; should not our presbyters rejoice that they offer to help through the heat of the day?[3]

In The Peoples Priviledges and Duty guarded Against the Pulpit and Preachers Incroachment (1652), which he dedicated to Cromwell, William Sheppard endeavors to give both the people and the preachers "the due

1. Lupton, The freedom of preaching, pp. 15-17.
2. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
3. Ibid., pp. 21-27.

place and weight . . . to stay the extremities that are on both sides, and if possible to give satisfaction therein."[1] Granting that God has appointed certain offices in His Church which are to continue unto the world's end, Sheppard says that no man may take these offices upon himself except he be called and set apart; yet the people argue that as they are commanded to search the Scriptures and to teach one another with the understanding given them, they must share in expounding and applying the Scriptures and that those who are especially gifted with these abilities may use them publicly (I Cor. 12:7, I John 2:27, I Peter 4:10-11).[2] Thus the controversy between the preachers and the people is whether gifted persons, not in office, may exercise their gifts by preaching in a constituted church without any call or solemn setting apart to the office of preaching. On behalf of the people, Sheppard endeavors to prove that "godly, sober, sound, humble and solid men" of whatever profession, trade or condition may open and apply Scripture to the use of hearers in a regular, settled and planted church without having any solemn external confirmation.[3] (1) It is illogical to permit a man to read Scripture to his family and to forbid him when a friend comes in, or to permit a gifted man to preach when the church is unsettled and to forbid him when the church is in need of reformation, or to permit a man to rebuke a friend for drunkenness and to forbid his speaking to a group of people tainted with Levelling opinions. (2) The preaching of private persons is nowhere condemned in Scripture; rather (3) the Word of God commands it, for how can private Christians exhort, comfort and reprove one another without opening and applying the Scriptures? (4) The prohibition of women speak-

1. William Sheppard, The Peoples Priviledges and Duty guarded . . . (13 lines), (London: for T. Brewster), 1652, "Preface," pp. 1-2.
2. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
3. Ibid., pp. 21-22.

ing in the church implies that it is permitted to men to do so; certain women did speak as foretold by the prophet Joel (I Cor. 11:4-5), but for some reason the apostle forbade it to women and permitted it only to men. Any man with a just claim to the throne may sit on it, and so any man who has a right to speak may claim that right. (5) The public speaking of private men has been approved by God (I Cor. 10:11, Num. 11:23, I Sam. 10:5-10, II Peter 2:5, II Chron. 19:6-7, Acts 7, Luke 2:25-26, & 36-38, Acts 8:2, Acts 24:25); this practice was a custom among the Jews and was used in the primitive church (Acts 18:28, John 18:20, I Cor. 14:26, I Peter 4:10). (6) The apostle Paul reproves the irregular use of this gift and lays down the right use to be made of it (I Cor. 1:14). (7) The word of God declares it may lawfully be done and with profit to the church (I Cor. 14:23-32). (8) Nature gives nothing in vain, and shall we think the God of nature has given these gifts for nothing? (9) Many godly and learned men have held that it is lawful for private men to use their gifts publicly for the benefit of the church. (10) This "Primitive Apostolical Institution" will benefit the church in that: (a) unbelievers will be converted (Acts 4:21); (b) men will be trained and tried for the work of the ministry (I Tim. 3:10); (c) the doctrine of the gospel will be kept pure (I John 4:10); (d) men will be stirred to be more zealous of spiritual gifts which will cause progress and growth in grace; (e) the gifts of the spirit will be kept vigorous and not quenched (I Thes. 5:18-19); (f) questions will be answered and doubts removed; (g) the saints will share with each other the blessed experiences of the spirit; (h) all this will make exceedingly for the glory of God in the manifestation of his manifold gifts of grace; (i) many "experimental truths of God" will be brought to birth and lukewarm professors will be stirred to life; (j) some of the preachers who have high thoughts of themselves will realize that

God may speak through others as well as through themselves.[1] Whereas the preacher in office makes preaching his calling and whole work, the people only share in this work, as they may share with the constable in keeping order; Matt. 28:19 gives a commission to the apostles but it does not exclude others from assisting them. Uzziah, Corah and Uzzah were punished because they undertook those things which belonged to the priests alone; nowhere is it forbidden of men to pray, read the Scripture, sing or preach.[2] To usurp the minister's office a man would have to lay claim to that office, to undertake the whole work, to assume its authority and to require wages—without having any right to do so. Gifted men only claim the right to serve God as they are able and as the occasion may arise; they are sent whenever God directs them to tell the good news of the gospel (Nahum 1:5, Isa. 52:7). Rom. 10:14-17 simply declares that some one must convey the message by which Jews and Gentiles are to be saved; unless someone goes to tell them of Christ, how can they know Him?[3] Every Christian has a general calling to serve his Lord in every way he can and a peculiar calling specifying a definite task and place. Does a tailor leave his calling when he prays; how then does he when he preaches? He does not pray nor preach as a minister in office but only as a servant of the Lord Jesus. To the objection that none of the reformed churches approve of gifted men's preaching, Sheppard replies that we are to live by the rule and example in primitive times and that while the office of foretelling things to come may now be ceased in ordinary times, the gifts and responsibilities of opening and applying the Word of God (I Cor. 13:9), of witnessing against the Antichrist (Rev. 11:3,6) and of testifying for Christ (Rev.19:10)

1. Sheppard, The Peoples Priviledges and Duty guarded, pp. 27-50.
2. Ibid., pp. 51-61.
3. Ibid., pp. 61-65.

have not ceased; as they are set forth as gospel ordinances (I Thes. 5:20, Joel 2:18, Rom. 12:6), they must continue.[1] In the primitive church there was a prophetical exercise in which the chief and most expert of the brethren shared with the ministers (I Cor. 14:31); where a similar exercise may be conveniently brought into the churches of today, "it ought not to be contemned."[2] Sheppard confesses that there have been abuses of the exercises but thinks that these would be corrected if they were allowed and regulated, for men would know the Scriptures so as to be on guard against error; some silly and ignorant men may proclaim absurdities, but the airing of these will make them harmless. He hopes that the lawmakers will review the two ordinances against private-men's preaching and will make them consistent with the laws of Christ and with the liberties and privileges of Christians.[3] Sheppard concludes his work by appealing first to the ministers that they encourage the people to search out the Scriptures and to speak to each other of the Lord; he wishes they could rejoice with Paul (Phil. 1:15) that Christ be preached and wish with Moses that all would prophesy. He reminds them that the papists forbade private men's reading the Scriptures for the same reason that they now give against private men's expounding the Scriptures.[4] Sheppard then appeals to the gifted brethren to test themselves, until an order and discipline can be set up for judging their fitness; first they should be sound in faith and unblamable in conversation and life, secondly that they practice with their families and friends until they are able to give a good account of themselves in public, thirdly that they wait for a call and invitation from others and not to put themselves forward. Sheppard condemns those who

1. Sheppard, The Peoples Priviledges and Duty guarded, pp. 42-43.
2. Ibid., p. 47.
3. Ibid., pp. 70-73.
4. Ibid., pp. 74-75.

would thrust themselves into other men's pulpits or cause a disturbance by questioning the minister while he preaches or draw away others from church to hear themselves.[1] He urges gifted men to preach humbly, soberly and orderly without giving offence or hurting any of Christ's people; he advises them to speak those simple gospel truths wherein salvation consists and not to meddle with things too high for their understanding. Magnify Christ's ministers and hear them as you would like others to hear you; labor to get and grow in grace as well as in gifts, and "especially labor to grow in humility and love."[2] Sheppard's third appeal is to the people themselves that they study the Scriptures to establish themselves and help others; he urges them not to despise the gifts which God has given them nor to neglect the use of them. He urges them to hold up the preachers office against the Levelling doctrine which would lay magistracy and ministry in the dust; he urges them also to encourage and cherish gifted men in the sober exercise of their gifts. He warns against pretenders of gifts and dispersers of corrupt and heretical doctrine; if men speak much of their abilities and "dispraise" those of other men, do not countenance them. He urges the people not to encourage the bitter division between the preachers and gifted men but to do what they may "to make and keep peace and friendship between them."[3]

Thanking Mr. Sheppard for upholding the ministerial office, John Collinges, nevertheless, in Responsoria ad Erratica Pastoris (1652), endeavors to show how "rotten are the foundations" of gifted men's preaching. It is granted that men may read and explain the Scriptures to their families, that they may privately exhort and rebuke one another, that they

1. Sheppard, The Peoples Priviledges and Duty guarded, pp. 78-80. Vide also pp. 23-27.
2. Ibid., pp. 81-82.
3. Ibid., p. 83.

may confer and repeat sermons, that they may even preach in extraordinary circumstances, but Collinges thinks these liberties are enough without private persons entering the pulpit and pretending to proclaim the Word of God.[1] Collinges warns that the Scriptures can be wrest to our destruction and that Satan also can give visions and motions.[2] The Word in the mouth of a private man is materially the same as in the mouth of a public officer, but it is not formally the same; "the one speaks with authority, the former only as a Scribe, the one as Christs messenger particularly entrusted, the other without any such commission."[2] There is a difference between being providentially sent and being permissively sent; gifts and opportunities do not alone constitute being providentially sent or else the devils would be providentially sent, for they have gifts and opportunities; the apostles had the authority to go and preach as ambassadors of Christ, and this is the meaning of being sent.[3] Collinges grants that private persons may make a discourse on the Scriptures where no lawful preacher can be heard or when the minister fails through sickness or otherwise; however, he thinks that it would be more profitable if the private person repeated a sermon to them or if the people went home to search the Scriptures and to pray privately.[4] To Sheppard's suggestion that nailors, bakers and weavers "have leave and encouragement to visit Parishes destitute and unprovided, and exercise their gifts," Collinges consents with these conditions: (1) that those so employed be fit for it, being eminently gifted with learning and sober; (2) that according to the apostle's rule they leave off making nails, baking and weaving and give

1. John Collinges, Responsoria ad Erratica Pastoris . . . (32 lines), (London: for R. Tomlins), 1652, pp. 12-13.
2. Ibid., pp. 95-96.
3. Ibid., pp. 98-100.
4. Ibid., pp. 102-103.

themselves entirely to reading, exhorting, etc. (I Tim. 4:15); and (3) that they be called and sent out and ordained according to the gospel rule. To Sheppards arguments, Collinges answers: a man can be priest in his own household without attempting to rule the church; he may continue to read Scripture if a friend accidentally comes in, but he may not call others into his "chariot" to see his zeal.[1] Prayer is "a piece of naturall worship" while preaching is "a piece of Instituted worship," and we must keep to the institution; God has bidden all to pray, but he has not commanded all to preach. The forbidding of some (the women) to preach does not mean all others may preach, for then heathens and unclean persons might enter the pulpit; private men have no more right to preach than ordinary men have the right to wear a crown.[2] Many men, equal in learning and godliness to Dr. Ames, Mr. Cotton and the five Apologists, judge private men's preaching unlawful; Dr. Seaman, Mr. Hall, Mr. Rutherford and others have answered all the Scripture references and have proved that the alleged instances of private men's preaching in Scripture are cases of extraordinary conditions (as when the church was unsettled). Paul also gave rules for the use of the gift of tongues, yet it, with the gift of prophecy, has long ceased. Bring forth one case today of extraordinary prophecy to prove that the gift continues; many may be able to expound Scripture, but who can expound it infallibly as could the "prophecyers" of Corinth? Gifts of themselves no more entitle a man to usurp the pulpit than they entitle a man to usurp the bench or throne. If the pretended benefits of this practice be re-examined, experience will show that the church may be destroyed and believers perverted by it; all the persent errors, blasphemies and heresies show what will come of the toleration of every man's preach-

1. Collinges, Responsoria ad Erratica Pastoris, pp. 106-114.
2. Ibid., pp. 117-119.

ing.[1] To say that the more public errors are the less harm they will do is pretty religion and a pretty argument for an universal toleration;

> let Christs face be spit upon, as much as it will, that his friends may wipe it off; is the Glory of the Lord Jesus Christ no more pretious in your eyes Sir? 'But the Preachers give all leave to Print.' No such matter (Sir) Mr. Batchelor indeed was wont to doe it, but Presbyterian preachers have learn'd Christ better, and tender his glory more. 'But the abuses may be prevented and the right use retain'd. That which you call right use Sir is an abuse.[2]

What Scripture rule can you give for the regulating of such an exercise; is not all order broken when one body had twenty tongues? The Scripture has given rules for the ordaining of church officers; if we part from them, all will result in confusion. Some will not believe in witches until some of their friends are bewitched;

> if you had a wife that with hearing a Cobler preach for the community of all things, had beene so convinced as to have made her selfe common, and have gone from you and joyn'd with a party of those principles, and two or three yeares after come home with a child or two more then you had seene before, (as some I could tell you of in the world this day have beene served) you might then possibly believe there were Hereticks, and yet those persons were high professors and pretended much to the Spirit.[3]

In regards to the magistrate, Collinges says he could tell the gifted brethren of a time when they were not such friends to the magistrates; "what if some Ministers were for a while unsatisfied in the late change? Was there nothing in it that might startle a tender conscience?"[4] If the two ordinances against the preaching of private persons remain until they are found "inconsistent with the laws of Christ they will be in force long enough."[5] In reply to Sheppard's appeals, Collinges says that the preachers must first know it their duty and not their sin to encourage the people to expound the Scriptures publicly; the advice to the gifted brethren is

1. Collinges, Responsoria ad Erratica Pastoris, pp. 135-136.
2. Ibid., p. 168.
3. Ibid., p. 169.
4. Ibid., p. 173.
5. Ibid., p. 176.

good except it omits requiring them to submit to examination and ordination; it is, however, shameful to call "away our people from us as from Babylon."[1]

After having a heated discussion after his lecture on infant baptism at Wilscome in Somersetshire, "fire broke out" during Francis Fullwood's next lecture on "whether the now Ministers of the Church of England, be the Ministers of Jesus Christ Exclusively."[2] Into the great congregation assembled on May 4th, Tom Collier came with a company of soldiers and disciples; he sat patiently throughout the two-hour discourse, but at its conclusion he stood up and "signified his not being satisfied with what was spoken; and here began the dispute." Having chosen moderators, Mr. Wood for the ministers and a Captain for the other side, Mr. Collier began by going through the sermon point by point, granting some and questioning other statements. To the statement that the Churches of England are true churches, he offers four objections: (1) their constitution was false; (2) the members are false; (3) their ordinances are false; and (4) their ministry is false.

> Collier: You were falsly constituted in Q. Elizabeth daies, for you were made true Churches by the civill power, the command of the Queen; and not by the Ministry of the Word, as you should have been.
> Fullwood: That is denied: for we were not reclaim'd from Popery by the Queens Command, without, but with the assistance of the godly Protestant Ministery. . . .
> Collier: But did not the people turn for fear of the power of the Magistrate? . . . Thomas Georges (Justice of Peace): . . . the renouncing of Popery, and embracing of the Protestant Religion, was a voluntary act of the whole Land, in their Representative the Parliament, that sate in the first year of Q. Elizabeths Reign.
> Fullwood: Mr. Collier hearken to the Gentleman, he is a Statesman, and knows what belongs to History better then you or I.
> Collier: But you should have been constituted by the Ministery of the Word.[3]

1. Collinges, Responsoria ad Erratica Pastoris, pp. 176-178.
2. Francis Fullwood, The Churches and Ministery of England true Churches and true Ministery . . . (18 lines), (London: by A. M.), 1652, "Preface."
3. Ibid., pp. 57-59.

After disputing whether the churches of England had lawful ordinances or ministry since they had received these through Rome, and whether the Church of Rome was a true church or not, Mr. Collier was asked to prove his own call.

> Collier: I grant that none may preach, but such as are sent: yet I believe that many are sent to Preach that are not in office.
> Fullwood: I pray you look over the Scripture, and see whether you can find one Text for that, Master Collier.
> Collier: The Prophets were not in office in the time of the Law, yet preacht.
> Fullwood: The Prophets were in office; the word Prophet is a name of office, though extraordinary.
> Collier: But Paul preacht before he was called.
> Fullwood: Not so; he preacht indeed before he received an ordinary call, but not before he had an extraordinary call:for Christ, when he came to call him to be a Christian, he made him a Minister; as is plainly expressed by Paul himself, Acts 26.[1]

As it had become quite late, they concluded their discourse with proper courtesies.

> Collier: I blesse God, that we have met with so moderate a man as you Master Fulwood.
> Fullwood: Truely, I did not expect to finde a man so sober and rationall among you, as you have been Master Collier.[2]

Six ministers who witnessed this dispute, "attested under their Hands" that this was "a true, though short, sum of that large Dispute."

Seeing how men "now adaies delight most in the loose notions of their own conceiving," John Ferriby undertook in his lectures at Epping to show that profit comes only in hearing commissioned preachers; however, before he had finished this subject, Captain Spencer was brought in to oppose what he preached. Either by a long discourse to the people before he preached or a short opposition afterwards Spencer sought "to subvert or prevent the reception" of Ferriby's doctrine; Ferriby writes:

> I told the Gentleman (who spake) that I conceived he ought not to speak there unless he were a Prophet, nor then unless he had a

1. Fullwood, The Churches and Ministery, pp. 71-72.
2. Ibid., p. 72.

> Revelation, nor then but when he may be subject to the Prophets: but proffered to justice what I had delivered either by a private communication, or a publick printing of my Notes, thinking by that way Truth might be examined to more profit, and with lesse passion, than by a tumultuary conference amidst an over-passionate multitude, than by a doubtful disputation among prejudiced and unknowing hearers. But that was not taken.[1]

As there had been "too many sad and fruitless examples of such conferences," Ferriby entered the controversy reluctantly "to prevent their boastings, that we dare not stand on argument, or a suspition in others that our cause would not endure a trial."[2] Because there had been misrepresentations of him, Ferriby publishes his position in The Lawful Preacher (1653), in which he states his thesis as "That the ordained Ministers only are those who (by the Apostles Command) are to be highly esteemed, and that to neglect them and their preaching is to neglect the Gospel."[3] Those who preach must be called and sent (Rom. 10:14-15, Jer. 14:14,23:13); in the Scriptures God witnesses against those who have no warrant to speak for Him and men should be afraid to run after such. This calling and sending is more than gifting, because the Scriptures distinguish gifting and sending (Isa. 6:5-9, Matt. 10:1-5, I Tim. 4:14, Heb. 10:5); the gifting of private and public men is also distinguished (I Thes. 5:11-13). Preaching is the work of those in office. A gifted man may give you bread and wine, but only a minister can administer the Sacrament; so a gifted man may speak some good words, but only a minister can preach the Word of Life. There is a vast difference between charitative admonitions of private Christians and the authoritative preaching of called ministers; men may find work enough at home without running out of their places to exercise

1. John Ferriby, The Lawfull Preacher . . . (13 lines), (London: for William Roybould, 2nd impression), 1653, "Preface," pp. 1-2.
2. Ibid., "Preface," p. 3.
3. Ibid., p. 7.

their parts.[1] Many of those who talk the most of liberty to use their gifts in public make the least use of them in private; many will go many miles to mount a pulpit and neglect to instruct their own house, "as if there were no vertue but in extremity, nor excellency but in excess." Ferriby compares them to "some filthy adulterers, who have handsome wives of their own . . . yet care not for the enjoyment of any, but whom they have no Commission to touch or desire."[2] Is not Christ's order for preaching good enough; will not the foundations of religion be overturned if Christ's ministry be abolished? The Scripture teaches that ministers are to be examined, approved and separated by fasting, prayer and laying on of hands; we must not depart from that order. If the laying on of hands in primitive times conferred the Holy Ghost, why was Timothy urged to read, meditate and study? The imposition of hands means (1) in Gen. 48:14,20, a blessing; (2) in Num. 8:12, a consecrating; and (3) in Num. 27:23 an appointing to office; in Acts 14:23, 6:6, all three meanings are used in ordination. Joel 3:18 means that when the Messiah should come, God would pour out His spirit to confirm the Gospel, which He did extraordinarily in primitive times and afterwards ordinarily which we experience; it cannot be a Gospel promise or else Paul crosses it by prohibiting women.[3] As for their having their ordination from Rome, Ferriby answers that the temple-vessels were not discarded because they had been in Babylon nor did men throw away the coins which in queen Mary's time bore "the Impress of the Popish Princess;" her "impress" did not adulterate the silver, neither did Rome invalidate the ordination from Christ. Ferriby concludes by asking his opponents to consider how the Papists and Socinians rejoice at

1. Ferriby, The Lawfull Preacher, pp. 8-18.
2. Ibid., pp. 25-26.
3. Ibid., pp. 36-39.

"our weakening" each other's hands; "what a breach we make for the open enemy to enter at."[1]

In The Triumph of Learning (1653), Robert Boreman undertakes to answer the queries proposed "after the second sermon" on October 3, 1652 by "a zealot" in the parish church at Swacie near Cambridge. To the query "whether a Lay-man may Preach," Boreman answers that to affirm he may preach, is as incongruous as to say that S. Paul was mistaken when he enjoined every one to abide in that calling to which he is called.[2] If it was a sin for Korah and his confederates to rise against Moses and for Saul and Uzziah to take upon themselves the priestly office, then it is unlawful for laymen to usurp the ministers place; "with the authority of Gods word, the consent of all antiquity, and the practice of all Reform'd Churches" Boreman concludes that no man ought to take upon himself the sacred function of preaching but he that is called by God through the church.[3] "Laymen that call themselves by a bold intrusion, we may lawfully call Usurpers of the Priests Office, of the Stock of Korah, of the race of Jeroboam's Priests." (I Kings 13:33). Until such "Incendiaries be suppressed," Boreman says there can be no peace for his distracted nation and warns that as once the divisions of the Jews destroyed their nation so will "our multiplyed divisions" make us "a derision to those that are round about us."[4]

In his Apologie for our Publick Ministerie (1652), William Lyford cites Num. 16:1-5, 35 as "a Monument to all Posteritie that None who is not called and consecrated, should presume to take upon him the office of

1. Ferriby, The Lawfull Preacher, pp. 40-45.
2. Robert Boreman, The Triumph of Learning over Ignorance . . . (10 lines), (London: for R. Royston), 1653, p. 31.
3. Ibid., pp. 31-33.
4. Ibid., p. 34.

"our weakening" each other's hands; "what a breach we make for the open enemy to enter at."[1]

In The Triumph of Learning (1653), Robert Boreman undertakes to answer the queries proposed "after the second sermon" on October 3, 1652 by "a zealot" in the parish church at Swacie near Cambridge. To the query "whether a Lay-man may Preach," Boreman answers that to affirm he may preach, is as incongruous as to say that S. Paul was mistaken when he enjoined every one to abide in that calling to which he is called.[2] If it was a sin for Korah and his confederates to rise against Moses and for Saul and Uzziah to take upon themselves the priestly office, then it is unlawful for laymen to usurp the ministers place; "with the authority of Gods word, the consent of all antiquity, and the practice of all Reform'd Churches" Boreman concludes that no man ought to take upon himself the sacred function of preaching but he that is called by God through the church.[3] "Laymen that call themselves by a bold intrusion, we may lawfully call Usurpers of the Priests Office, of the Stock of Korah, of the race of Jeroboam's Priests." (I Kings 13:33). Until such "Incendiaries be suppressed," Boreman says there can be no peace for his distracted nation and warns that as once the divisions of the Jews destroyed their nation so will "our multiplyed divisions" make us "a derision to those that are round about us."[4]

In his Apologie for our Publick Ministerie (1652), William Lyford cites Num. 16:1-5, 35 as "a Monument to all Posteritie that None who is not called and consecrated, should presume to take upon him the office of

1. Ferriby, The Lawfull Preacher, pp. 40-45.
2. Robert Boreman, The Triumph of Learning over Ignorance . . . (10 lines), (London: for R. Royston), 1653, p. 31.
3. Ibid., pp. 31-33.
4. Ibid., p. 34.

ministring holy things," and Jude 11 as proof that it is a sin "to level church-offices, or intrude into the actions of sacred Ministerie, whereto one is not called."[1] In Zech. 13:3-5, husbandmen and tradesmen are made to recant and repent of pretending the Spirit by the magistrates, whereas in our times

> our Magistrates . . . rather uphold them, having enfranchized every Sect to hold Assemblies to preach who will; yea, to the disadvantage of Christ's Gospel, have suffered his Ministers to bee vilified.

No man can call himself a prophet or ambassador or steward without a commission; without authority, "all sacred actions are meer nullities and mockeries, like a Judgment without a Jurisdiction." Lyford says, "Christ hath committed to us the word of reconciliation, and wee in his Name and with his Autoritie do tender and seal God's covenant."[2] If lawful preachers should be provoked by these unlawful ones "to a more spiritual and conscionable discharge of their duties, 'twere good . . . but what good els this promiscuous preaching hath don" is not evident. To those who plead "for their pattern and warrant Christ's making Preachers of Fishermen," Lyford answers: (1) Christ called them from their Trades to a higher employment; (2) Christ called them, trained them, ordained them and sent them; (3) Christ gave them power to heal the sick, cleanse the Lepers, raise the dead.

> But you have no such mission, nor new abilities: Here is the difference between Christ and men, hee doe's not finde men fit, but make's them fit, and so send's them; But wee must finde them fit, or els not send them: Neither must any run before they bee sent. Jer. 23.21.[3]

1. William Lyford, An Apologie for our Publick Ministerie . . . (5 lines), (London: by William Du gard), 1652, pp. 17-19.
2. Ibid., p. 20.
3. Ibid., p. 30.

CHAPTER EIGHT

LAY-PREACHING DURING PROTECTORATE (1653-1658)

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTECTORATE
   A. The issue of toleration
   B. Lay-preaching maintained

II. THE DEBADE CONCLUDED (1658-1659)
   A. Martin, Petto and Woodal
   B. Matthew Poole
   C. John Collinges
   D. Woodal and Petto

III. THE CONGREGATIONAL AND BAPTIST PRACTICE
   A. John Bunyan's preaching
   B. Confessions and activities

IV. THE EARLY QUAKER PREACHERS
   A. George Fox's preaching
   B. "First Publishers of Truth"
   C. Early organization of preachers
   D. Preachers of the southern mission
   E. Restrictions and adjustments

The question of church settlement was one of the factors which broke the Commonwealth and made Cromwell the Lord Protector. On February 10, 1652, John Owen presented to the House a scheme for church settlement which called for a national church with a toleration for all who accepted the basic principles of the Christian faith; local commissions were to determine the fitness of candidates for the ministry and itinerant commissioners were to inspect ministers and schoolmasters and to eject those whom they found unfit. This plan had its critics,[1] and the Dutch War with the indecision of Parliament delayed the church settlement and the needed reforms. By August 1652 the army had become impatient with the House's delays and excuses, and in January 1653 it demanded that there should be a new Parliament. When the House (April 20, 1653) attempted to push through a "Perpetuation Bill" whereby the members of Parliament would retain their seats in the new Parliament and would serve as a committee to pass on the seating of the new members, Cromwell, in a fit of anger, drove the remnant of that body from its chamber and locked the door behind them. The man who had saved Parliamentary government in England by the sword used that sword to sever the last thread of constitutional power; nevertheless, at that time his deed was cheered by many.[2] Firth says that "when Cromwell dissolved the Long Parliament, he had no definite plan for the future government of England;[3] but two of his major-generals were soon making suggestions. Lambert, the ambitious

1. Vide Firth, Cromwell, pp. 306-307. Masson, op. cit., vol. IV, pp. 612-614.
2. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 253.
3. Firth, Cromwell, p. 329.

politician, recommended that the power of State be vested in a small council of ten or twelve with an elected assembly, both submissive to a written constitution. Harrison, the unselfish dreamer, proposed that the authority be given to a council of seventy members (like the Jewish Sanhedrin) who should reign as the saints of God until Christ returns to take up His rule upon the earth. As one of the leaders of the Fifth Monarchy men, Harrison believed that three great monarchies of the world's history had fallen and that the fourth (Roman) was tottering so that at last Christ was about to begin the Fifth Monarchy upon earth; he often quoted the text, 'The saints shall take the kingdom and possess it.' Cromwell worked out a compromise of these two plans, calling upon the Independent churches of each English county and in Ireland and Scotland to submit a list of God fearing men, of whom one-hundred and forty were selected by the Council of Officers and summoned in the name of the General of the army to sit in consultation upon the affairs of the Commonwealth. When these "godly men" assembled at Westminster on July 4, 1653, representatives of Scotland and Ireland met with those from England for the first time "in the name of the three peoples;"[1] opening in high expectation of beginning a new era of freedom and happiness, they assumed the title of Parliament and proceeded to redress the grievances of the land. The English royalists nicknamed this assembly "the Barebones Parliament" and the Scottish Presbyterians called it the "Daft Little Parliament;" nevertheless, as Trevelyan, Firth and others point out, the work which was undertaken by these men was hardly that of religious bigots or fanatical madmen. The Court of Chancery which had become corrupted and scandalized by greedy lawyers was abolished, and a committee was appointed

1. Tanner, op. cit., p. 169.

to codify the law and to reduce the legal volumes into 'the bigness of a pocket book.' Civil marriages were established and all births, marriages and burials were required to be registered; acts were passed for the relief of debt-prisoners and for the care of idiots and lunatics. It was proposed that all the parish ministers should be put down, and it was only accidentally defeated by two votes; Baxter says it was taken for granted in this "Sectarian Parliament" that "the Tythes and Universities would at the next Opportunity be voted down."[1] The Fifth Monarchists, under Harrison's leadership, were denouncing the clergy as hirelings and priests of Baal, who with all other "anti-Christian" forms must be destroyed in preparation for Christ's return;[2] having gained a majority in the House, these extremists were on the verge of approving disestablishment and disendowment when the moderates, assembling early on the morning of December 12, 1653, declared that their sitting would no longer be for the good of the Commonwealth and marched out of the House to Whitehall where they signed an act of abdication, returning the powers to the Lord General of the army.[3] Having been told by Lambert and other moderate army officers that if he would not "'undertake the government they thought things would hardly come to a settlement, but blood and confusion would break in upon us,'" Cromwell consented to the Constitution presented in their "Instrument of Government," and on December 16, 1653 was solemnly installed as Lord Protector.[4] There had been so much commotion, change and confusion that many welcomed a stronger government; a written constitution seemed to be a firmer foundation than popular consent; it was

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, p. 70.
2. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. IV, pp. 511-516.
3. Vide Firth, Cromwell, pp. 340-341.
4. Ibid.

said:

> 'It is high time that some power should pass a decree upon the wavering humours of the people, and say to this nation, as the Almighty Himself said once to the unruly sea: Here shall be thy bounds; hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther.'[1]

The new constitution called for a balance of power among three branches of government: the Lord Protector, a perpetual council and a Parliament which was to sit for five months once in three years. The ecclesiastical settlement called for a national church to be maintained by tithes until some better way could be worked out, with a toleration, outside of the establishment, of all persons professing 'faith in God by Jesus Christ' as long as there was no disturbance of the public peace or any effort to promote Popery or Prelacy.[2] Two commissions were set up: one of Triers who were to approve all ministers before they received any income from endowment and another of Ejectors who were to remove any "scandalous, ignorant and insufficient" minister or schoolmaster.[3] Cromwell favored the comprehension of Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists in the national church, with liberal freedom outside for the innumerable congregations which supported their own minister or whose minister supported himself; on one occasion he declared that he had rather permit Mahometanism than that "one of God's children should be persecuted."[4] There were, however, many who did not share his devotion to such a generous toleration. In their Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici (1654), the Provincial Assembly of London denounces those who plead for "a liberty of preaching, or (as they phrase it) for the exercise of gifts in publick" and asserts that "none may assume the office of the Ministry, unlesse he

1. Ut per Firth, Cromwell, p. 341.
2. Dale, op. cit., pp. 320-321.
3. Tanner, op. cit., p. 180.
4. Ut per Firth, Cromwell, p. 307.

be solemnly set apart thereunto."[1] Universal toleration of all religions and universal allowance of all who suppose themselves gifted to preach without ordination, they conceived "unsufferable in a well-ordered Christian Commonwealth."[2] The Presbyterian ministers grant liberty to: (1) a private brotherly teaching, (2) a parental instruction of children and servants, (3) an exhortation of a general to his army or a charge of a judge on the bench, (4) a Divinity exercise in school, (5) an admonition of members in a sacred or civil assembly, and (6) a proclamation of the gospel in extraordinary cases.[3] They declare that only ordained ministers may authoritatively preach the Word "to a Congregation met together for the solemn worship of God, in the stead and place of Christ." (1) Mission is essential to the constitution of a minister (Rom. 10:5); he is sent to the people and not by the people. "A bare providential sending" is not sufficient; "an authoritative mission" is needed.[4] (2) No man ought to take the ministerial honor upon himself unless called by God (Heb. 5:4-5); if the prophets and priests of the Old Testament, Christ and the apostles of the New Testament--all waited until they were sent by God, it is great presumption for any man now to make himself a minister before he is lawfully ordained.[5] (3) The titles ambassadors (II Cor. 5:20), stewards (Titus 1:7), watchmen (Ezekiel 3:7), Angels (Rev. 2:1) which are given to ministers are names of office and require a special designation from God. (4) The Scriptures distinguish between gifts and calling (John 20:21-22, Isa. 6:6-9, Jer. 1:5-9); gifts are a necessary qualification but without a lawful calling and sending, a man is only an usurper and may fear the

1. Jus Divinum Ministerii . . . (19 lines), (London: Published by the Provincial Assembly of London), 1654, p. 67.
2. Ibid., p. 192.
3. Ibid., p. 80.
4. Ibid., p. 70.
5. Ibid., p. 72.

judgment pronounced upon Corah.[1] (5) The rules laid down in Scripture (I Tim. 3:2-3, 4:14) are either unnecessary or else no man ought to take this office without following them. (6) Confusion would come into the church if every man presumes to preach without a call; in the Scripture there is no precept that any should hear, obey or maintain those who run before they are sent; there is no promise of assistance, protection or success to unlawful preachers.[2] This Presbyterian attitude was evident in the first Protectorate Parliament (Sept. 3, 1654) which after trying to amend the Instrument of Government proposed to exclude certain 'damnable heresies' from the toleration and to restrict the Protector's control of the army and to reduce its size by half. Tanner says that as the army was "the sole guarantee of toleration," it was feard that if it were reduced and placed under Parliament, persecution of the sects would result sooner or later.[3] To prevent this, Cromwell dissolved Parliament without its approving the new government, and the ecclesiastical settlement which Cromwell and the Council had made continued without any major change until the Restoration. The two main pillars of this settlement were comprehension and toleration. Cromwell declared that if any man of the "three judgments" (Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist) have "the root of the matter in him,"[4] he may be admitted into the national Puritan church which required no agreement on ritual, doctrine or discipline; Firth says "it was not so much a church as a confederation of Christian sects working together for righteousness, under the control of the State."[5] Buchan says the Cromwellian settlement was "the most tolerant yet seen in England" and

1. Jus Divinum Ministerii, pp. 73-74.
2. Ibid., pp. 90-94.
3. Tanner, op. cit., p. 183.
4. Cromwell Letters, vol. V, p. 64.
5. Vide Firth, Cromwell, pp. 368-369.

describes it as "an honourable effort to raise the spiritual level of the people."[1] The religious toleration which this settlement offered was regarded by Cromwell as "the most precious fruit of civil war and its retention was to be his constant preoccupation."[2] Under this guarded toleration, lay-preaching reached its zenith and at least three denominations gained enough strength to survive the persecution which came after the sword dropped from Cromwell's hand.

While lay-preaching was more prevalent under the Protectorate than at any other time in our study, there are indications that it was becoming more orderly and was beginning to be channeled into two main denominations. Tanner says that the establishment of the Protectorate "registers the turn of the tide," not only in establishing "a Parliamentary system which admitted sinners as well as saints" but also in checking the religious radicals;[3] even Baillie confessed (1656) that "all who are wise thinks that our evills would grow yet more if Cromwell were removed."[4] The political and religious radicals united in denouncing the Protectorate; the Republicans, under Lilburne, cried that as all authority came from the people they had been betrayed and robbed in their representatives being relegated to a "third place in the Constitution."[5] The Fifth Monarchists, under Harrison, denounced Cromwell for taking the place which they thought should be left vacant for the "King of Heaven;" one of their preachers prayed, "'Lord, thou hast suffered us to cut off the head which reigned over us, and thou hast suffered the tail to set itself up and rule over us in the head's place.'"[6] There was an agitation within the army to

1. Buchan, op. cit., p. 443.
2. Jordan, op. cit., vol. III, p. 146.
3. Tanner, op. cit., pp. 186-187.
4. Baillie, Letters, vol. III, p. 318.
5. Tanner, op. cit., p. 185.
6. Ut per Gardiner, Protectorate, vol. III, p. 114.

overthrow the usurper; after failing to temper this fever, Cromwell had Harrison arrested and other Fifth Monarchist leaders were removed from the army. Many Baptists who shared the views of the Fifth Monarchy were also dismissed from the service, but those who were obedient to authority kept their commissions without any difficulty.[1] Firth says that

> the character and temper of the army was very sensibly modified during the later years of its existence. Religious enthusiasm still worked powerfully amongst the soldiers, but it had come to adopt less extravagant forms.[2]

It seems that Cromwell and the army leaders came "to the conclusion that some regulation of the right to preach was necessary;" in the Calender of State Papers we find, under the date July 7, 1653, the following order which Firth describes as being "almost equivalent to the ordination of five officers named:"[3]

> Declaration that Council is satisfied concerning the gifts and abilities of Major Wm. Packer, Capts. Jas. Strange, John Spencer, and Thos. Impson, Quartermaster Foxley, and Wm. Kiffin, to preach the Gospel, and that the public exercise thereof will be of great use in the Church, they being eminent for godliness, and that therefore they may have free use of any pulpits to preach in, as the Lord gives opportunity, those places not to be used at the same time by their own ministers.[4]

The news of Cromwell's preaching captains and colonels spread afar; Ambassador Whitelocke records the following conversation he had with the Queen of Sweden on December 26, 1653:

> Queen: I have been told that many officers of your army will themselves pray and preach to their soldiers; is that true?
> Whitelocke: Yes, Madam, it is very true. When their enemies are swearing or debauching or pillaging, the officers and soldiers of the Parliament's army use to be encouraging and exhorting one another out of the word of God, and praying together to the Lord of Hosts for his blessing to be with them, who hath shown His approbation of this military preaching by the successes He hath given them.

1. Firth, Cromwell's Army, pp. 343-344.
2. Ibid., pp. 339-340.
3. Ibid., p. 348.
4. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1653-1654, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green, (London: Longman & Co., 1879), p. 13.

Queen: That's well. Do you use to do so too?

Whitelocke: Yes, upon some occasions in my own family; and think it as proper for me, being the master of it to admonish and speak to my people when there is cause, as to be beholden to another to do it for me, which sometimes brings the chaplain into more credit than his lord.

Queen: Doth your General and other great officers do so?

Whitelocke: Yes, Madam, very often and very well. Nevertheless they maintain chaplains and ministers in their houses and regiments; and such as are godly and worthy ministers have as much respect and as good provision in England as in any place in Christendom. Yet it is the opinion of many good men with us, that a long cassock with a silk girdle and a great beard do not make a learned or good preacher without gifts of the Spirit of God, and labouring in his vineyard. And whosoever studies the Holy Scripture, and is enabled to do good to the souls of others, and endeavours the same, is nowhere forbidden by that word, nor is it blamable.

The officers and soldiers of the Parliament held it not unlawful, when they carried their lives in their hands and were going to adventure them in the high places of the field, to encourage one another out of His word who commands over all; and this had more weight and impression with it than any other word could have; and was never denied to be made use of but by the Popish prelates, who by no means would admit lay-people, as they call them, to gather from thence that instruction and comfort which can nowhere else be found.

Queen: Methinks you preach very well, and have now made a good sermon: I assure you I like it very much.

Whitelocke: Madam, I shall account it a great happiness if any of my words may please you.

Queen: Indeed, Sir, these words of yours do very much please me, and I shall be glad to hear you oftener on this strain. But I pray tell me, where did your General, and his officers, learn this way of praying and preaching yourselves?

Whitelocke; We learned it from a near friend of your Majesty, whose memory all the Protestant interest hath cause to honour.

Queen: My friend! who was that?

Whitelocke: It was your father, the great King Gustavus Adolphus, who, upon his first landing in Germany, as many then present have testified, did himself in person upon the shore, on his knees, give thanks to God for his safe landing, and before his soldiers himself prayed to God for his blessing upon that undertaking; and he would frequently exhort his people out of God's word; and God testified his good liking thereof by the wonderful successes He was pleased to vouchsafe to that gallant King.

To this the Queen made no further reply, but, as her manner was, sometimes she would discourse of the English wars, and sometimes of the present treaty, and fall out of one matter into another, full of variety and pleasant intermixed discourses.[1]

1. A Journal of the Swedish Embassy in the Year 1654. Impartially written by Ambassador Bulstrode Whitelocke (first published by Charles Morton, new ed., revised by Henry Reeve, 2 vols. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Langmans, 1855), vol. I, pp. 247-249.

Sometimes an officer became a regular chaplain; in Monch's order-book, Firth says that there is a note (August 20, 1655) to Quartermaster Arthur Hebb that the general had received his letter, and "'in case he be to leave his quartermaster's place, and the regiment shall be well satisfied in choosing him to be their chaplain, the general will be well satisfied therewith.'"[1] In a speech to his second Parliament (April 21, 1657) Cromwell suggests that the meaning of the fifth paragraph of Article Five of the New Instrument which incapacitated public preachers from sitting in Parliament should be restricted to real ministers with a pastoral charge and not include all who occasionally preach; "for I must say to you, in behalf of our Army," Cromwell declared,

> in the next place to their fighting, they have been very good 'Preachers:' and I should be sorry they should be excluded from serving the Commonwealth because they have been accustomed to 'preach' to their troops, companies and regiments:—which I think has been one of the blessings upon them to the carrying-on of the great Work. . . . There may be some of us . . . who have been a little guilty of that, who would be loath to be excluded from setting in Parliament 'on account of it.'[2]

Cromwell was successful in maintaining as much of religious freedom as was possible in that age; even some of those who denounced him as an usurper had to admit that they, under his rule, enjoyed "Liberty and Advantage to preach the Gospel with Success."[3] Baxter confesses that during the Protectorate the gospel and godliness were promoted more than at any previous time; yet the minister of Kidderminster was opposed to laymen's preaching and tried to ward it off from among his people by putting something in his sermons which was "above their own discovery" and thereby keeping them humble.

1. Ut per Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 339, footnote.
2. Cromwell's Letters, vol. V, p. 51.
3. Reliquiae Baxterianae, pp. 86-87.

> When Preachers tell their People of no more than they know, and do not shew that they excel them in Knowledge, and easily over-top them in Abilities, the People will be tempted to turn Preachers themselves, and think that they have learnt all that the Ministers can teach them, and are as wise as they.[1]

Baxter tells us that as his people were much inclined to private meetings, he encouraged them in having them and was usually present himself, "answering their Doubts, and silencing objections, and moderating them in all."

> If I had not allowed them such as were lawful and profitable, they would have been ready to run to such as were unlawful and hurtful: And by encouraging them here in a fit exercise of their parts, in Repetition, Prayer, and asking Questions, I kept them from inclining to the disorderly exercise of them, as the Sectaries do. We had no Meetings in opposition to the Publick Meetings; but all in subordination to them; and under my over-sight and guidance; which proved a way profitable to all.[2]

The debate concerning the liberty of preaching continued with perhaps less heat and more reason throughout the Protectorate; one of the finest presentations in defense of gifted men's preaching appeared in 1658. In answer to Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici and Collinges' Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici, John Martin, Samuel Petto and Frederick Woodal published The Preacher Sent, in which they confessed that there had been abuses in the liberty of preaching as there had been at first in the free reading of Scripture but they argue that the abuse of a good thing does not invalidate the thing itself.[3] It is granted that officers are necessary in the churches of Christ by divine institution; however, it is stated that the ministry stands in contrast to lordly domination (Matt. 20:25-27). In one sense all who serve may be called ministers (II Cor. 9:1); but as they do not give themselves constantly to that

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, pp. 71, 93-94.
2. Ibid., p. 88.
3. John Martin, Samuel Petto and Frederick Woodal, The Preacher Sent: or, A Vindication of the Liberty of Publick Preaching by some men not ordained . . . (11 lines), (London: for L. Chapman), 1658, "Epistle Dedicatory."

work, gifted brethren cannot properly be called ministers of the Gospel. As a man is an officer to a particular church, he can minister lawfully and authoritatively only to that congregation; when he preaches to unbelievers or to those Christians not committed to his care, he does so ex dono and not ex officio. The question is not of every man's preaching but whether those Christians whom the church of Christ judges (I Tim. 3:10) to have gifts and graces may exercise them publicly, although they be not ordained officers.[1] Although gifted men may not preach in public assemblies authoritatively, i. e. office-wise as being over them in the Lord, yet "they have authority, i. e. a right and lawful power from Christ, charitatively to preach in publick assemblies."[2] If a general bids a man gifted with abilities of a captain to do the work of a captain and gives him authority to do it, then that man may do so; or if a king appoints a private man to an office and empowers him with authority, may he not serve?

> Now, Christ the King of Saints, and the great Captain-General of our Salvation who had all power in Heaven and Earth given unto him, he hath commanded every man that hath grace, and is gifted, to preach; and therefore, every man who hath Grace, and is gifted, may Preach.[3]

Our writers do not argue from the general rules of stewardship alone but from "a particularizing of Preaching gifts" (I Peter 4:10-11); they declare that

> it is not Gifts, but Christ (by Gospel Rules) that warranteth and giveth the Authority or power to gifted persons to preach. Gifts do qualifie and enable a person to the Act: Christ by Gospel Rules warranteth the acting in that way. Gifts (with graces) are declarative that the person is warranted or authorized to Preach: Charity bindeth to follow Gospel-Rules in the exercise of gifts for the good of others.[4]

The words in I Peter 4:10 include all spiritual gifts, of which the gift

1. Martin, Petto & Woodal, The Preacher Sent, pp. 19-20.
2. Ibid., pp. 28-29.
3. Ibid., p. 39.
4. Ibid., p. 40.

of preaching is surely one; therefore, every one who has preaching abilities and who is not otherwise forbidden to do so, may preach and improve their ability by gospel command. To the objection that private Christians go out of their calling and place whenever they exercise their gifts in public, our writers reply that

> Gods end in affording a publick gift is not onely a mans own private advantage, or the benefit of his family, but the publick advantage of the whole church. (I Cor. 12) . . . every man that hath such gifts, it belongeth to his place and calling, to use those gifts for the common good of the Church or for the best advantage and profit thereof, else he crosseth the end of the Spirit, in bestowing those gifts, which is, that he might profit with them.[1]

An officer may perform acts of his office privately as when he rebukes one over whom he is set in the Lord; yet it is done authoritatively, for "publickness doth not make an Act to be an Act of office, nor privateness hinder it from being so." The "publickness" of preaching does not make it authoritative; therefore, gifted brothren cannot be accused of usurping the minister's office, as they do not preach office-wise.[2] Hebrews 5:12 implies that Christians of other callings may later become teachers and so change their calling, or else preach in addition to their other calling. I Cor. 7:20 does not forbid an occasional doing the work of others nor the changing of one's calling; it is interpreted in verse 24 as meaning, Let him abide with God in his calling, as examplied in being married or in bondage to an unbeliever.[3] I Peter 5:1 ff. speaks of the duties of church officers, and I Peter 4:10 seems to speak plainly of every man in contrast; everyone cannot be restricted to officers, nor can all gifts be interpreted in terms of preaching; it is enough that the gift of preaching be included.[4] Apollos was not an ordained officer, because he knew only the baptism of

1. Martin, Petto & Woodal, The Preacher Sent, pp. 47-48.
2. Ibid., p. 49.
3. Ibid., pp. 53-54.
4. Ibid., pp. 60-61.

John; he was not an extraordinary officer, for he did not know of the Holy Ghost. No mention is made of a commission from John, and the emphasis placed upon his gifts would imply that it was by reason of them that he preached. It was possible for him to receive ordination at Jerusalem or elsewhere, and so extraordinary circumstances cannot be argued as a justification of his preaching. His rank with Paul and Peter (I Cor. 1:12, 3:5) came afterwards at Corinth where he might have been an officer (for gifted men may afterwards become officers), but his preaching at Ephesus (Acts 18:24) was by another authority. As for the preaching of the scattered saints (Acts 8 & 11), our writers do not claim that the scattering was perpetual or that every Christian in Jerusalem fled, yet all cannot be restricted to officers as the whole church was not ordained. Philip's ordination was that of a deacon, which ordination gave him no authority to preach (Acts 6:6); the Scriptures' silence as to the possibility of the saints receiving any authority from the apostles implies that as the persecution had scattered them they preached as they had the opportunity. It is true that the persecution necessitated the saints to scatter or to travel, yet the persecution itself did not necessitate them to preach; "therefore necessity can be no plea in this case."[1] In the settled church at Corinth and under normal conditions, those who had a gift of prophesy had the liberty to use it in the church assemblies. There is no mention of their ordination, and therefore it may be concluded that they were not ordinary church officers; they could not have been extraordinary officers, for the apostle commanded every member to covet the gift of prophesy. Although prophets are enumerated among the officers, other gifts were also enumerated (I Cor. 12:4, 30-31) and prophesy is called a gift (I Cor. 13:2,

1. Martin, Petto & Woodal, The Preacher Sent, pp. 83-87.

Rom. 12:6). In primitive times prophesying was ordinary; it was appointed by divine authority, and rules were given to regulate its use; since nowhere in Scripture is there any mention of the repeal of these rules or of prophesying ceasing, we must conclude that the laws for its use are still in force and that prophesying itself still continues.[1] As for the sending (Rom. 10:15), our authors answer that Christ's commission to preach cannot be limited to ordination. Mission or sending is not a call to office, for the disciples were officers before they were sent (Matt. 28:19) and the deacons were ordained yet we read not of their mission; there is no Scripture which makes ordination and mission the same. Sending in Scripture-sense is "either Christs commanding by his word, or assigning preachers, to go and publish the Gospel unto such persons or such a people;"[2] it is neither church nor presbytery but only Christ who commands or assigns a person to go and to preach. A man cannot be sent to preach before he has a command to preach; now the command is given or mediated by the written word.

> As God command in his word would be a mediate call to hear the word preached, to pray, to be baptized, to receive the Lords Supper, and to perform other Religious services, though no Presbyters should exhort to these duties; so Christs command in the Gospel, to goe and Preach,—is a mediate mission . . . though no presbyters should urge it upon them.[3]

As it is the duty of gifted men to preach, it is the people's duty to hear (Rom. 10:16, 21). Paul's word to Timothy (I Tim. 1:3-4) concerning choosing elders or bishops or Paul's leaving Titus to ordain elders in Crete (Titus 1:5) does not restrict preaching to such. Gifted men do not presume to preach office-wise, and therefore cannot be charged with

1. Martin, Petto & Woodal, The Preacher Sent, pp. 88-115.
2. Ibid., pp. 121-125.
3. Ibid., p. 130.

Rom. 12:6). In primitive times prophesying was ordinary; it was appointed by divine authority, and rules were given to regulate its use; since nowhere in Scripture is there any mention of the repeal of these rules or of prophesying ceasing, we must conclude that the laws for its use are still in force and that prophesying itself still continues.[1] As for the sending (Rom. 10:15), our authors answer that Christ's commission to preach cannot be limited to ordination. Mission or sending is not a call to office, for the disciples were officers before they were sent (Matt. 28:19) and the deacons were ordained yet we read not of their mission; there is no Scripture which makes ordination and mission the same. Sending in Scripture-sense is "either Christs commanding by his word, or assigning preachers, to go and publish the Gospel unto such persons or such a people;"[2] it is neither church nor presbytery but only Christ who commands or assigns a person to go and to preach. A man cannot be sent to preach before he has a command to preach; now the command is given or mediated by the written word.

> As God command in his word would be a mediate call to hear the word preached, to pray, to be baptized, to receive the Lords Supper, and to perform other Religious services, though no Presbyters should exhort to these duties; so Christs command in the Gospel, to goe and Preach, is a mediate mission . . . though no presbyters should urge it upon them.[3]

As it is the duty of gifted men to preach, it is the people's duty to hear (Rom. 10:16, 21). Paul's word to Timothy (I Tim. 1:3-4) concerning choosing elders or bishops or Paul's leaving Titus to ordain elders in Crete (Titus 1:5) does not restrict preaching to such. Gifted men do not presume to preach office-wise, and therefore cannot be charged with

1. Martin, Petto & Woodal, The Preacher Sent, pp. 88-115.
2. Ibid., pp. 121-125.
3. Ibid., p. 130.

usurping that office; those believers who are really gifted (not barely who presume themselves to be so) "have a regular Call to preach; and this doth not prostitute either the office or the work unto the wills of men, nor open a door to disorders—it being the declared will of Christ, that such should preach."[1] The work of preaching can no more be confined to the ministerial office than Christian charity can be confined to the deacon's office. Every Christian is charged to do all in their power to bare witness to the faith that is in him (Heb. 5:12, I Cor. 9:16). Jer. 23:21, 32 does not reprove the preaching of gifted men but refers to prophets who declared falsehoods; they are reproved for not preaching the Word of God. Gifted men have Scripture-precepts, promise and example to warrant their preaching, and therefore they may do so in faith (Matt. 25:28-29; Acts 11:19-21, 18:28; Mal. 3:16-17.)[2] No other learning is required than the knowledge of doctrines which Paul taught and the ability to teach them to others (II Tim. 2:2). As gifted men preach occasionally and not regularly, they do not expect or ask for maintenance; they plead only for the liberty to declare the good news. Our authors deny that the churches of Christ in all ages have rejected this practice and say, "we are to follow churches no further than they follow Christ."[3]

Matthew Poole in Quo Warranto (1658), which was written at the appointment of the Provincial Assembly of London in answer to The Preacher Sent, repeats much that had already been said; he denounces the opinion that every gifted man may preach as

> a Trojan Horse, whence the adversaries of the Truth may break out and destroy the City of God, a Pandora's Box, from whence all sorts

1. Martin, Petto & Woodal, The Preacher Sent, p. 149.
2. Ibid., p. 185.
3. Ibid., p. 215.

of mischievous and foul poysoning opinions may fly out, and that without remedy.[1]

As the apostles were very solicitous in committing the office of the ministry to fit persons, "nothing would have been more incongruous to the wisdome and faithfulnesse of the head of the Church, then to prostitute them to the fancies and humours of every invader."[2] After arguing that a minister is minister to the whole church and not limited to one particular congregation by his ordination, Poole says that the Suffolk ministers would distinguish truly gifted men and men who think themselves gifted but they establish no authority to judge between the two; thus despite their protestation, the "gap" through which that crew has come to wreck the poor church and nation is still left open for greater ills. An examination and a solemn setting apart is needed for all who would publicly declare, publish open and apply "Gospel-truths." As for a general's speaking on a religious topic to his troops, Poole endeavors to distinguish between finis operis and finis operantis (the end of the work in its own nature and the end of the worker); while the end of religious speaking is the salvation of men's souls, yet in the mouth of a general the end becomes to encourage them to battle; therefore that cannot be called preaching.[3] The text I Peter 4:9-11 may refer to hospitality and not to preaching; those who have an ability of admonition may use it privately. Apollos was an extraordinarily endowed officer (I Cor. 1:12) who spoke publicly to divers Jews not gathered into a church assembly. Although it is doubtful whether the scattered saints were officers or not, their case was one of persecution and necessity when they spoke occasionally of the things of God to

1. Matthew Poole, Quo Warranto; or, A Moderate Enquiry Into The Warrantableness Of The Preaching of Gifted and Unordained Persons. . . . (15 lines), (London: by J. H.), 1658, "Epistle to Reader."
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p 41.

persons they met and therefore their case can be no warrant for unordained men to preach publicly in a settled church in normal times. The Corinthian prophets were enriched with extraordinary gifts to prophesy; their practice gives no liberty to ordinary men to preach. Poole concludes with a summary of the standard arguments against the preaching of unordained men which we need not consider.[1]

In Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici Revindicatae(1658) John Collinges rejoices that his brother-ministers are "sensible of the great abuse of that Liberty, for which they plead" and wonders if they have not observed

> that most of those sad Earthquakes, which have rent the bowels of the Church, and overturned some churches of God, both in Holland and in Old and New England, have been caused by the wind of this Liberty, which they still endeavour to keep up.[2]

Collinges says he could thank his brethren more if he could have seen that they fixed a rule of regulation for this liberty, for while they claim to plead only for such as are really gifted, they do not tell us who is to judge whether they be so or not; they say it is convenient for the church to judge but those who preach without this judgment do not sin.[3] Gifted men may be called "speakers if you please, but they cannot in a strict and proper sense be called ministers;" nowhere in Scripture are gifted unordained men called ministers of the gospel.[4] Neither is there any scriptural warrant for preaching ex mero dono. Collinges asserts that the office and its work cannot be separated and that ordination is more than the choice of a man by a particular congregation.[5] Every private man

1. Poole, Quo Warranto, pp. 115-120.
2. John Collinges, Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici Revindicatae: or the Preacher (pretendedly) Sent, Sent back again . . . (16 lines), (London: by J. M.), 1658, "Epistle Dedicatory."
3. Ibid., "Epistle", pp. iv-v.
4. Ibid., pp. 7-8.
5. Ibid., p. 41.

may lawfully speak to his neighbor of the gospel; a magistrate may exhort his people to righteous living; a colonel may encourage his soldiers; but

> Authoritative preaching, is an Ordinance of the Lord Jesus Christ under the Gospel, to be dispensed in the publike assemblies of people, by the Preachers opening and applying of the Word of God which he hath appointed, as the ordinary means of faith and salvation to which all people are in Conscience bount to attend.[1]

A gifted man may cry like a herald with a loud voice; he may speak the good things of the gospel either privately or publicly; he may run and speak to the walls or go and read the Scriptures in his neighbor's house: this preaching Collinges calls charitative or precarious preaching, in which the preacher may beg but cannot command attention.[2] Charity may bind gifted men to preach in case of necessity, but this is not ordinary preaching. Collinges says:

> We will not contend with our Brethren that it is unlawfull for a private gifted person to speak in the publike Assemblies of the Church, provided it be not on the Lords day, which ought to be spent in peoples attendance upon publike Ordinances of which nature their preaching cannot be: but we deny, that any are bound to hear them, or that any can come to hear them as unto that ordinance of Preaching, which lyes under the great appointment of God to save peoples souls. And we say, the Church of God hath had no such custom.[3]

It is not clear that the gift spoken of in I Peter 4:10-11 is "preaching parts" and that the command is a universal one. Gift is used in the New Testament for "any good thing which is freely given us of God, whether in a way of special providence or common or special grace;" it is used in Rom. 5:15-16 to express gifts of special grace, in I Cor. 12:9, 28-30 extraordinary gifts, in I Cor. 1:7, 7:7, 12:4 any common or special gift; in Rom. 12:6-8, I Tim. 4:14 it is used to express office. The argument made from Matt. 25:29 could be used for usurping the magistrate or

1. Collinges, . . . Revindicatae, p. 42.
2. Ibid., p. 45.
3. Ibid., pp. 52-53.

administering the sacraments as well as for the preaching of unordained men.[1] As for Apollos, Collinges says, "it is very probable his gifts were of another species, from that which our gifted men now adays have; it is said he was mighty in the Scriptures." To the opposition that Apollos was ranked with Paul and Peter after his first preaching, Collinges says:

> a very little time it seems; for the Text saith, he went soon into Achaia; and in the first verse of the next chapter he is reported in Corinth. So that it is plain that he preached only in order to office, that he might be proved; in which case our brethren know we allow preaching ex dono.[2]

The scattered Christians might have commended the gospel privately to people as they had opportunity; not only was it necessary for them to travel, but being filled with extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost and there being no other means for the salvation of the people whom they met, it became necessary for them to witness to their faith.

> Those who preach in such Cases of necessity, where people can have no ordained Ministers to hear, may be said to Preach by an extraordinary authority, which the word of the Lord hath in such cases given them, which may be called a Mission, and they may be Officers, as to that time, and state; yet it will not follow but in another state of the Church Ordination is essential to an ordinary Minister, that is, to one who according to the Rule of Christ in ordinary cases ought to preach.[3]

The prophets of old received the gift of prophecy with their office so that their office might be considered a gift; the prophets in Corinth were either extraordinary officers or ordinary officers with extraordinary gifts, peculiar to that state of the church. Acts 11:27-28, 19:6, I Cor. 12:9-11, 28 and Eph. 4:11-12 clearly show that gospel-prophesying was one of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost. St. Paul's charging Timothy to study and meditate is proof that this prophesying was to cease. As for there being no mention of its cessation or the repeal of the rules

1. Collinges, . . . Revindicatae, pp. 56-57.
2. Ibid., p. 59.
3. Ibid., pp. 63-64.

governing it, Collinges says,

> the ordaining Pastors and Teachers in Churches, and committing government to them, was enough, and the cessation of their extraordinary Mission was enough. So we say for these Prophets the cessation of the Gift manifested by obvious experience, is a demonstration to us that prophecie is ceased, where is there any now that can without study and meditation, infallibly give the sense of Scriptures from revelation, or can foretell things to come?[1]

Collinges again asks who is to judge the gifting of men; if the Presbytery is not, nor the church, then every man may claim a gift and a mission from Christ and the order which Christ has taken for his church will be destroyed. In those cases where the Scriptures are not clear, it is best to follow the practice of those churches which have been blessed with order than to follow new opinions which cause confusion and disorder.[2]

In the early part of 1659 Woodal and Petto (Martin having died) replied to Poole and Collinges in A Vindication of the Preacher Sent. As for the errors and blasphemies supposedly released out of Pandoras Box of liberty of preaching, Woodal and Petto ask if ordination be

> a Venice-glass that can hold no poyson? Are you not partial, who can finde Errors, Heresies, impertinencyes among persons not ordained, but among the ordayned omnia bene? Alas what learned nonsense, amongst many of them? What empty notions? What Aiery speculations? how often are people served with bones instead of bread? . . . They that condemn too much Lead in a window, because it hinders light, might be offended with painted glasse.[3]

In reply to the accusation that they have fixed no rule of regulation on this liberty, they say that all doctrine must conform to the sacred Scriptures and that the standard or measure of qualification need not be fixed by them for a man may be qualified for one place or people and not for another; the rule for the reducement of error or for the correction of abuse is fixed in Matt. 18:15-16, Col. 4:7, I Cor. 5:12, Rev. 2:2. Herein

1. Collinges, . . . Revindicatae, p. 70.
2. Ibid., pp. 114-117.
3. Frederick Woodal and Samuel Petto, A Vindication of the Preacher Sent . . . (18 lines), (London: by J.T.L. Chapman), 1659, "To the Reader," p. ii.

is a Scripture rule for the approbation of preachers not in order for ordination.[1] Gifted men have "a Divine allowance to Preache," and if Dr. Collinges likes not to call them ministers, "let him call them (as the Apostle doth I Cor. 14) by the name of Prophets."[2] As a man is mayor only in relation to the town he governs, so is a man a church officer only in relation to the church he serves. Preaching ministers are called elders of the church (Acts 20:17) and stood in a particular relation to a particular congregation and were not supreme rulers of a universal visible church.[3] The commission given in Matt. 28:19 was not restricted to the apostles but included all Christians. The apostles were extraordinary officers and as such have had no successors. Since the preaching of gifted men is built upon a command of Christ and a gospel promise, they are obliged to preach and the people are obliged to hear them; in this sense, theirs is an authoritative preaching. By Dr. Collinges' distinction between authoritative and precarious preaching, there can be no authoritative preaching outside that of a minister to his own particular congregation; whenever he preaches to another people, not under his charge, he does so ex dono and not ex officio. Our writers make this difference between dispensation of the word and the administration of sacraments:

> Baptisme and the Lords Supper are acts so purely of institution, that they would never have been duties, nor could have been known to be so, without Scripture-light; and so are not to be dispensed by any (though gifted) without an allowance thereunto by the institution, which is the onely determining rule about the Administrator and Administration.
>
> But as prayer is a natural duty, though commanded over in the Gospel, and many rules laid down to regulate & direct in the performance of it; So Preaching is in it self, is an act of natural worship, if there had been no Scripture rules laid down about it, yet man by natures light might have learned it to be a duty to publish the will

1. Woodal and Petto, A Vindication of the Preacher Sent, "to the Reader," p. iv.
2. Ibid., p. 2.
3. Ibid., pp. 12-13.

> of God his Creator unto others according to ability and opportunity and therefore the Law of nature doth firstly lay gifted men under obligations to preach, and this is seconded by Gospel rules. . . . (I Peter 4:11, Heb. 10:25, Acts 18:26-28).[1]

Our authors argue that the command of Christ constitutes a call to preach and warrants the preaching of gifted men on the Sabboth or Lord's Day as well as at any other time. A man who is apt in government may help by council and advice without pretending to have the power to enforce his judgments. The gospel-promise (Matt. 25:29) is in general terms; hence every man (not excepted) is to use his talents. The church of I Peter 4:11 was not in a scattered state; it had elders (I Peter 5:1), and yet permitted the preaching of gifted men. So did the Reformers of Scotland;

> for, in their petition to the Queen they did ask. 1. That they might have prayers publikely in their vulgar Tongue. 2. That if any hard place of Scripture were read in their meetings, it might be lawful to any qualified person in knowledge, being present, to interpret and open, &c. Hist. of Reform. Scot., pag. 128. which practice was of use in the Jewish Congregations Grot. Mat. 4.23.[2]

As Apollos knew only the baptism of John, it would appear that his gifts were not extraordinary (Acts 18:25) and that at the time of his first preaching he was not in office; "his being mighty in the Scriptures, maketh it probable that he received them [the gifts] in an ordinary way, as now a dayes."[3] If all the scattered Christians had extraordinary gifts for preaching, then the gospel knows occasional preachers as so many could not have had opportunity for constant preaching. It cannot be proved that they did not preach before the scattering or that they acted only privately wherever they went. The argument of the infant or persecuted state of the church could be used to condition all gospel precepts and precedents; if the preaching of gifted men were lawful in such a critical time, how could

1. Woodal & Petto, A Vindication of the Preacher Sent, pp. 24-25.
2. Ibid., pp. 26-27.
3. Ibid., p. 31.

it be declared unlawful in a settled condition of the church.

> How men being persecuted from their habitations can render their preaching Lawful, which otherwise were not, or lay them under either a natural or moral necessity to preach in their travels, beyond what they should have, if their occasions did not lead them to the same places without persecutions, we understand not.[1]

The persecution neither scattered the apostles nor necessitated them to stay where they were; therefore, there were means of salvation other than the preaching of the scattered saints. If necessity gives an extraordinary authority which the word of the Lord allows in such cases, why may not men be sent by the word in ordinary times? Jeremiah and Amos were extraordinary officers with gift and office combined, but the gift of prophecy was promised to extend beyond that of office (Joel 2:28); all men could not be church officers (I Cor. 12:17), yet all men were to aspire to those gifts of prophecy. The rules to regulate this work of prophesying are ordinary as are the descriptions of it (I Cor. 14:3); no extraordinary acts are recorded, and "there is not one sylable of proof, that foretelling things to come is the prophesying intended." Extraordinary public prophesying is allowed to women (Luke 2:36-38), but the Corinthian prophesying was denied them (I Cor. 2:36-38). The charging of Timothy to study and meditate is little proof that this prophesying was to cease.[2] As for the preaching of gifted men invalidating the ministerial office, it is reasoned that as the main duty of colonels and captains is the fighting of the enemy and is not invalidated because their soldiers fight, so the preaching of gifted men does not destroy the office of pastor or minister. Preaching in itself is not an act of office, but preaching as an act of office is done by one who is over his hearers in the Lord and as one

1. Woodal & Petto, A Vindication of the Preacher Sent, p. 33.
2. Ibid., pp. 45-46.

charged with feeding them with the word. By Christ's appointment, gifted men may do materially the same acts as officers and for the same ends of conviction, conversion and edification; yet "there is a vast difference between their actings." Christ appoints both and yet gives different authorities to each, as captains and colonels have different authorities from the same general. The preaching of officers does not make the preaching of gifted men unnecessary, else God would have given his gifts in vain; the preaching of gifted men does not invalidate the preaching office, else God would have instituted that office in vain.[1] The Scriptures speak of maintaining constant preachers; if an occasional preacher should be moved to give himself wholly to preaching and to the work of the church, he may find maintenance from those people to whom he preaches. God sends by means of his word and providence; his "commanding gifted men to Preach, by his word, is a mediate Call, and his saying by that word, go, is a mediate mission, though no Presbytery by ordination otherwise saith go."[2]

In 1659 a tinker-preacher, at the close of his service in a barn, was challenged by a Cambridge professor to cite his authority to preach. The tinker replied that the church at Bedford had sent him; to which Thomas Smith retorted that as the Church at Bedford was only of lay people they could not give what they did not have. Carrying his argument into print, A Letter to Mr. E. of Taft, Smith renews his attack by declaring, "If any man among you (though he be a wandering preaching tinker, for you must give me leave to call him so till I know what other name he hath) seemeth to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, that man's religion is vain;" he reviews the arguments against laymen's preaching and concludes

1. Woodal & Petto, A Vindication of the Preacher Sent, pp. 55-56.
2. Ibid., pp. 62-63.

that it is not only dangerous and sinful for laymen to preach but that it is also sinful to hear them.[1] The tinker did not reply, but another Cambridge men, who had repudiated his episcopal orders to be ordained "a messenger to divulge the gospel of Jesus Christ" by the General Baptist Church at Fenstaton, appealed to Smith not to be angry with the tinker because he "strives to mend souls as well as kettles." Henry Denne says that as the tinker proved his mission and commission from the church at Bedford, most of Smith's letter is wasted and needless; he asks if ship-wrecked men might preach to heathens why might not a congregation choose "'some fitting men full of faith and the Holy Ghost to preach to other unbelieving heathen.'"[2] Whenever the tinker found his pen, he did not bother to address Mr. Smith, nor even to thank Mr. Denne; nevertheless in his spiritual autobiography, Grace Abounding, John Bunyan gives this intimate account of how he found his voice and why he endeavored to use it in proclaiming the Gospel of Christ:

> . . . after I had been about five or six years awakened, and helped myself to see both the want and worth of Jesus Christ our Lord, and also enabled to venture my soul upon him; some of the most able among the saints with us, I say, the most able for judgment and holiness of life, as they conceived, did perceive that God had counted me worthy to understand something of his will in his holy and blessed word, and had given me utterance, in some measure, to express what I saw to others for edification; therefore they desired me, and that with much earnestness, that I would be willing at some times to take in hand, in one of the meetings to speak a word of exhortation unto them.
>
> The which, though at the first it did much dash and abash my spirit, yet being still by them desired and entreated, I consented to their request, and did twice at two several assemblies, but in private, though with much weakness and infirmity, discover my gift amongst them; at which they not only seemed to be, but did solemnly protest, as in the sight of the great God, they were both affected and comforted, and gave thanks to the Father of mercies for the grace bestowed on me.

1. Thomas Smith, The Quaker Disarmed. With A Letter in Defence of the Ministry and Against Lay-Preachers (London: by J. C.), 1659.
2. Henry Denne, The Quaker no Papist (London), 1659.

After this, sometimes, when some of them did go into the country to teach, they would also that I should go with them; where, though as yet I did not, nor durst not, make use of my gift in an open way, yet more privately still, as I came amongst the good people in those places, I did sometimes speak a word of admonition unto them also; the which they as the other, received with rejoicing at the mercy of God to me-ward, professing their souls were edified thereby.

Wherefore, to be brief, at last, being still desired by the church, after some solemn prayer to the Lord, with fasting, I was more particularly called forth, and appointed to a more ordinary and public preaching the word, not only to and amongst them that believed, but also to offer the gospel to those who had not yet received the faith thereof. About which time I did evidently find in my mind a secret pricking forward thereto: though, I bless God, not for desire of vain-glory, for at that time I was most sorely afflicted with the fiery darts of the devil concerning my eternal state.

But yet could not be content, unless I was found in the exercise of my gift, unto which also I was greatly animated, not only by the continual desires of the godly, but also by that saying of Paul to the Corinthians, 'I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the household of Stephanus, that it is the first-fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,) that ye submit yourselves unto such, and to every one that helpeth with us, and laboureth.' (1 Cor. xvi, 15, 16.)

By this text I was made to see that the Holy Ghost never intended that men who have gifts and abilities should bury them in the earth, but rather did command and stir up such to the exercise of their gift, and also did commend those that were apt and ready so to do. 'They have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.' This scripture in these days did continually run in my mind, to encourage me, and strengthen me in this my work for God. I have also been encouraged from several other scriptures and examples of the godly, both specified in the word and other ancient histories. (Acts viii. 4, 18, 24.25. 1 Pet. iv. 10. Rom xii. 6. Foxe's Act and Mon.)

Wherefore, though of myself of all the saints the most unworthy, yet I, but with great fear and trembling at the sight of my own weakness, did set upon the work, and did, according to my gift, and the proportion of my faith, preach that blessed gospel that God had showed me in the holy word of truth: which when the country understood, they came in to hear the word by hundreds, and that from all parts, though upon sundry and divers accounts.

And I thank God he gave unto me some measure of bowels and pity for their souls, which also did put me forward to labour, with great diligence and earnestness, to find out such a word as might, if God would bless it, lay hold of, and awaken the conscience, in which also the good Lord had respect to the desire of his servant; for I had not preached long before some began to be touched, and be greatly afflicted in their minds at the apprehension of the greatness of their sin, and of their need of Jesus Christ.

But I at first could not believe that God should speak by me, to the heart of any man, still counting myself unworthy, yet those who thus were touched, would love me and have a particular respect for me; and though I did put it from me, that they should be awakened by me, still they would confess it, and affirm it before the saints of God;

> they would also bless God for me, unworthy wretch that I am! and count me God's instrument, that showed to them the way of salvation. Wherefore seeing them in both their words and deeds to be so constant, and also in their hearts so earnestly pressing after the knowledge of Jesus Christ, rejoicing that ever God did send me where they were; then I began to conclude it might be so, that God had owned in his work such a foolish one as I; and then came that word of God to my heart, with such sweet refreshment, 'The blessing of them that were ready to perish is come upon me; yea; I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.' (Job xxix. 13.)
>
> At this therefore I rejoiced, yea, the tears of those whom God did awaken by my preaching would be both solace and encouragement to me; for I thought on those sayings, 'What is he that maketh me glad, but the same that is made sorry by me?' (2 Cor. xxii.) II Cor. 2:2 . And again, 'Though I be not an apostle to others, yet, doubtless, I am unto you, for the seal of my apostleship are ye in the Lord.' (1 Cor. vi. 2.) I Cor. 9:2 . These things, therefore, were as another argument unto me, that God had called me to, and stood by me in this work.[1]

As for the doctors and priests who did "open wide" against his preaching, Bunyan says he was persuaded "not to render railing for railing" but to show even them "the want and worth of Christ." He tells us that he preached as one sent from the dead, not caring to meddle with controverted or disputed things but earnestly contending for "the word of faith and the remission of sins by the death and sufferings of Jesus." He preached what he did "smartingly feel," not using "other men's lines" but proclaiming what was taught by "the Word and Spirit of Christ" which he found could be "spoken, maintained, and stood to by the soundest and best established conscience."[2]

> My great desire in fulfilling my ministry, was, to get into the darkest places of the country, even amongst those people that were farthest off of profession: yet not because I could not endure the light . . . but because I found my spirit leaned most after awakening and converting work, and the word that I carried did lean itself most that way also.[3]

1. John Bunyan, Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners, (1666), The Entire Works of John Bunyan, ed. Henry Stebbing (4 vols. London: James S. Virtue, 1864), I, 35-36. As this is perhaps the most intimate account of why "mechanic men" undertook so great a task, we beg to be forgiven for quoting such a long passage.
2. Ibid., pp. 36-37 passim.
3. Ibid., p. 38.

There came a time when Bunyan was tempted to be proud of his gifts, but he realized that of themselves they were "empty and without power to save the soul of him that hath them;" by these very gifts he was made a servant to the church and would be held accountable for the use he made of them. Like other "mechanic preachers," Bunyan had to face slander, malice and prevarications; it was rumored that he was a witch, a Jesuit, a highwayman and that he had mistresses and illigimate children; to which Bunyan replies, "I have a good conscience, and whereas they speak evil of me, as a evil doer, they shall be ashamed that falsely accuse my good conversation in Christ."[1] The fame of Bunyan's writings has elevated him above the host of "mechanic preachers," but it is well to note that in the earlier part of his ministry he was only one of that countless host of men who preached without a full ordination. He tells us that after exercising his gifts for some time among believers, he was "more particularly called forth and appointed to a more ordinary and public preaching the word;" whatever this service was, it was not a full ordination, for we know that he was not an ordained minister or pastor until December 21, 1671 and that he had begun preaching sometime in the year 1656.[2]

In this respect, Bunyan might have typified the Baptist and Congregational evangelist of his day,[3] for both of these denominations approved and used itinerant preachers and seem to have evolved some service of recognition or sending of them by their mother churches. The Congregationalists, as the Independents began to call themselves during the

1. Bunyan, Grace Abounding, vol. I, pp. 38-39 passim.
2. Vide "Note written in the Bedford Church Book" as cited by Vera Brittain, In the Steps of John Bunyan (London: Rich and Cowan, n.d.g.), 158.
3. Vide John Brown, John Bunyan (1628-1688) His Life, Times, and Work (Tercentenary ed., revised by Frank Matt Harrison, London: Hulbert Publishing Co., 1928), 236-238 for discussion of Bunyan's denominational affiliation. Brown concludes that Bunyan was "a Baptist of a very mild type."

Commonwealth and Protectorate,[1] had many educated and able ministers who accepted "livings" within the national church and who became prominent leaders under Cromwell's rule; many of these had written ably in the defense of the liberty of preaching and had sought to modify the tension between the preachers and the gifted men. In the Savoy Declaration (1658), which Dale describes as "perhaps, the most admirable statement of the ecclesiastical principles of English Congregationalism," the following principle was set forth:

> Although it be incumbent on the Pastors and Teachers of the Churches to be instant in Preaching the Word, by way of office, yet the work of Preaching the Word is not peculiarly confined to them, but that others also gifted and fitted by the Holy Ghost for it, and approved (being by lawful ways and means in the Providence of God called thereunto) may publiquely, ordinarily and constantly perform it, so that they give themselves up thereunto.[2]

Likewise in their Confessions, the Baptists stated their belief and practice of gifted men's preaching. In 1644 the Seven (Particular) Baptist Congregations of London declared that those

> whom God hath given gifts being tryed in the Church may and ought . . . to prophesie, according to the proportion of faith, and so to teach publickly the Word of God, for the edification, exhortation, and comfort of the Church.[3]

Many of the signers of this declaration were denounced as being "illiterate" and "of the meanest of the people".[4] Masson says that while some of the Baptist leaders (Tombes, Cornwall, Jessey, Cox and Denne) were University men who had renounced their orders, many were "laymen who had recently assumed the preaching office, or been called to it by congregations, on account of their natural gifts."[5] Both Anglicans and Presbyterians

1. Vide Dale, op. cit., pp. 374-376.
2. Article XIII ut per Dale, op. cit., p. 387.
3. Article 45, ut per W. J. McGlothlin, Baptist Confessions of Faith (London, 1911). 186.
4. Vide Thomas Crosby, The History of the English Baptists (4 vols., London, 1738), I, "Preface," lvi-lviii.
5. Masson, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 148-149.

considered most of the Baptist ministers laymen, as they had not been ordained by either bishop or presbytery; but as Whitley points out, "from the Baptist standpoint they were exemplifying the priesthood of all believers, that it is the duty of every man in or out of office to win converts to Jesus Christ."[1] When Lamb was brought before the Lord Mayor of London on the charge of violating the ordinance against laymen's preaching, Lamb replied that he had been appointed to that office by as reformed a church as any in the world; only at the intercession of some influential friends was he, however, released from the goal.[2] When Hanserd Knollys was reminded by the Committee of Divines that he had renounced his ordination by the bishop, he said that "he was now ordain'd, in a Church of God, according to the order of the gospel, and then declar'd to them the manner of ordination used among the Baptists;" when commanded not to preach any more, he replied that "it was more equal to obey Christ who commanded him, than those who forbad him."[3] Andrew Wyke refused (1645) to answer questions about his authority to preach, saying that "a freeman of England was not bound to answer any interrogatories, wither to accuse himself or others," for which obstinacy he was sent to the goal.[4] In the Lambeth Library there is a letter, dated January 22, 1648, addressed to "the right honourable Soisstinant Generall Cromwell," in which twenty-eight men, presumably Baptist, express their appreciation, "That there is Liberty granted to M^{e} Knowles & M^{e} Giffin according to our desire to come among us, whose Labours (through Gods blessing) are like to bee not only worsy [?] comfortable to us in particular, but wory [?] profitable

1. W. T. Whitley, A History of British Baptists (London: Charles Griffin & Co. Ltd., 1923), 68.
2. Crosby, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 193, 226.
3. Ibid., p. 230.
4. Ibid., p. 235.

to the State in generall."[1] As we have noted, Cromwell held no prejudice against the Baptists in his army, and as they proved themselves they were promoted; Whitley says, "many won their way to high rank."[2] Whatever rank or position they held, the Baptist soldiers told people of their faith; Whitley says, "it is quite instructive to study the rise of Baptist churches where regiments were quartered, or even where they conducted lengthy siege." At Newport Pagnell Hobson won over the incumbent, and Turner founded a church at Newcastle; Colonel Wigen planted Baptist churches in Lancashire and Cheshire, and Major-General Robert Overton fostered the Baptist cause wherever he went.[3] We are told that the Baptist Church at Leith "owed much of its freedom of action to Major-General Lillburne, who was himself a Baptist and that the Baptist Church at Ayr had been gathered by Captain Spencer.[4] In 1653 Captain Edmund Chillenden was granted the use of the Stone Chapel in St. Paul's for his church, and in the same year Major William Packer and Captain John Spencer were granted, by the Council of State, the authority to preach in any unoccupied pulpit.[5] Dr. Whitley says, in July, 1653, "the Baptists were at the zenith of political and military power;"[6] but within a few months the more conservative Puritans won over them. Many Baptists were republicans or Fifth Monarchists who opposed Cromwell's becoming Lord Protector; others, like Kiffin, Spilsbury and Richardson, regarded the Protectorate as the best government under the circumstances and were content to take advantage of

1. Lambeth Library M.S. dcccxl. 119.
2. Vide Whitley, British Baptists, pp. 74-75.
3. Ibid.
4. Vide The History of the Baptists in Scotland From Pre-Reformation Times, ed. Geo. Yuille (Glasgow: Baptist Union Publications Committee, 1926), 24-29.
5. Vide Underwood, op. cit., pp. 74-76.
6. Ut per Ernest A Payne, The Baptists of Berkshire (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1951), 17.

the religious freedom granted them.[1] A few Baptist ministers accepted benefices within the national church, but most of their leaders opposed it. Despite these differences which divided the Baptists at that time, there was a general agreement in regards to the right of laymen to preach. The "Thirty Congregations" of General Baptists stated (1651) that:

> '. . . some of the gifted men should be appointed or set apart to attend upon the preaching of the word, for the further edifying of the Churches. . . . That there be an orderly improving of those gifts that God . . . hath bestowed on the Saints (let them be exercised) one by one, speaking the things they have learned of God, that the hearers may be profited. . . .'[2]

In their Confession of 1654 the General Baptists restated this view "'that every member aught to exercise his gift for the benefit of others'" (Matt. 25:27, I Peter 4:10),[3] and the Somerset Confession (1656) declares that brethren in ministering their gifts ought to do it decently and in order.[4] It was the practice among General Baptists to have several preaching elders within a single congregation and for these ordained ministers to set an example by laboring and working with their hands, although it was the duty of their congregation (if they were able) to provide "a comfortable subsistence" for them.[5] It was the practice of both General and Particular Baptists to have, in addition to local pastors or preaching elders, an itinerant ministry or a band of evangelists or voluntary preachers who travelled about the country, preaching as they had opportunity and sustaining themselves by their own manual labor or voluntary offerings. Whitley cites Thomas Collier as representative of this "great body of lay-preachers;"[6] it will be remembered that Collier had preached at the army head-

1. Vide Underwood, op. cit., pp. 79-80
2. Ut per William Latane Lumpkin, The Local Baptist Confessions of Faith of the Civil War--Commonwealth Period (unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1948).
3. Ibid., "Appendix D."
4. Vide Crosby, op. cit., vol. I, "Index", pp. 52-53.
5. Ibid.
6. Whitley, British Baptists, pp. 71-72.

quarters and had debated at Oxbridge and Wineliscombe; in forty-six years of his active preaching, he wrote almost as many pamphlets. It seems that among these travelling preachers there was some understanding or arrangement whereby each had a district assigned to him; Collier's area was "substantially Wessex," of which he was appointed in 1655 the "General Superintendent and Messenger to all the Associated Churches;" in 1656 he presided over a conference of sixteen of these churches. Later when the law and his increasing age limited his travelling, the churches which he had founded "looked to him for pastoral care."[1] As another example of these itinerant Baptist preachers, Barclay cites Samuel Oates, who was sent out by Lamb's church in Bell Alley, London; a weaver by trade, this young man became "a popular and acceptable preacher, and an able disputant" who labored primarily in Sussex and Surrey. When imprisoned because a woman died a few weeks after he had baptized her, "numbers of persons came down in their coaches from London, to visit him."[2] Baxter knew these wandering preachers; at Glocester he contacted "about a dozen young Men, or more, of considerable Parts" who labored to draw others after their opinion against infant baptism, and at Coventry he proved more than their match in debate so that they sent for one of their chiefs, Mr. Benjamin Cox, "no contemptible Schollar, the Son of a Bishop."[3] In describing the number of tradesmen who shared in this evangelistic effort, Whitley says:

> The score of ex-clergy were lost in the multitude of common men who ministered to their fellows, speaking out of an experience they shared with those they addressed. The priest-hood of all believers was illustrated on a new scale. . . . Even the villager or the burgess rose to his opportunity, spoke to his neighbours, or laid

1. Whitley, British Baptists, pp. 71-72.
2. Barclay, op. cit., pp. 71-72. On one occasion a mob threw him into a river, in order 'thoroughly to dip him.'
3. Reliquiae Baxterianae, pp. 41-46 passim.

> down his tools & travelled over a county, preaching. It was the apostolic age again, without a Paul.[1]

Although there were some capable men among them, the Baptists lacked leadership; Jordan says that their energy and interests "were completely expended in evangelical effort under a lay leadership which was neither competent nor disposed to contribute notably to the maturing of the philosophy of the sect."[2]

In the latter part of 1647, a young shoemaker spoke "a few powerful and piercing words" at Dunkinfield and Manchester; later he spoke at a great meeting of Baptists at Broughton, and from this time George Fox "began to attract attention."[3] On one occasion at Mansfield, where he was still following his trade, he prayed so fervently that the house seemed to be shaken; in 1648, he preached to some Baptists in Nottingham and found many "tender people" among them. Sometime about the end of 1648, Fox received a larger commission to go abroad into the world "to turn people to that inward light, Spirit and grace, by which all might know their salvation and their way to God;" he was called to bring men away from human "inventions and windy doctrines;" he also tells us,

> when the Lord sent me forth into the world, He forbad me to put off my hat to any, high or low, and I was required to Thee and Thou all men and women, without any respect to rich or poor, great or small.[4]

Fox says that he was wounded by "the black earthly spirit of the priest" and that the ringing of the bell to call the people to the steeple-house

1. Whitley, British Baptists, pp. 96-97.
2. Jordan, op. cit., vol. III, p. 458.
3. William C. Braithwaite, The Beginning of Quakerism (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1912), 43. ". . . as late as the year 1648 Fox was in doubt as to the work of his life, and, indeed . . . an experience of this year is referred to as taking place 'before the Lord did send me forth to preach His everlasting gospel.' The beginning of propagandist may be dated back to 1647, but not earlier." (p. 42).
4. George Fox, Journal (Bi-centenary ed., 2 vols., London, 1891), I, 35-41.

struck at his life, for "it was just like a market-bell, to gather people together that the priest might set forth his ware to sale."[1] At Mansfield he endeavored to tell the people that they had "a Teacher within them" and therefore needed not to go to hear another; at Nottingham he interrupted a preacher who said that the Scriptures were the touchstone of all doctrines and controversies by declaring that "the Scriptures were not y^{e} Judg, but y^{e} holy ghost y^{t} gave them forth was the Judg and Toutchstone;"[2] for this disturbance Fox was sent to prison. At Lester when the minister refused to answer a woman's question at the close of the sermon, Fox stood up and spoke of women's prophesying; afterwards some of the people gathered in a house where "the power of the Lord came over them." At Darby Town, he spoke when "y^{e} priest had done" and was brought before the Justice, Mr. Gervase Bennet, who "first called us Quakers;"[3] for saying that he was without sin as Christ had taken his sins away, Fox was sent to a house of correction. Fox was once offered his freedom if he would become a soldier, but when he told the Commissioners that he "stood in that which took away the occasion of warrs and fightings" they told the goaler to put him in the dungeon; after nearly a year of imprisonment, he was released on October 30, 1650 "in the Common wealths dayes," and went north into Yorkshire where he found a warm welcome among those who were called

1. Fox, Journal, vol. I, pp. 35-41.

2. The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox (Tercentenary ed., ed. Norman Penney, Cambridge: University Press, 1925), 1. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., appendix, pp. 531-537 for discussion of Fox's Journals.

3. Ibid., p. 4. In his Great Mistery, Fox says that the word Quaker means Trembler and that Bennet first gave them this name "though the mighty power of the Lord God had been known years before;" "quaking and trembling we own, though they in scorn tell us so." Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 57 for a likely interpretation of Bennet's phrase. Cf. Barclay, op. cit., pp. 317-318.

Seekers.[1] Many of the Seekers were already far advanced when Fox came into their midst and so were ready to receive his message and to follow him. Trevelyan says that Fox

> had an overwhelming, perhaps hypnotic, power and presence, like one of the ancient prophets. To hear Fox preach once in the churchyard as he passed through the town, or to spend an evening with him by the fireside, often was enough to change a persecutor into an enthusiast, to emancipate a man from the intellectual habits and social customs of a lifetime.[2]

As Russell says, Fox was as convincing a preacher to the educated as he was to the poor; he won not only boys and poor women but cultured men and scholars.

> His style was rugged and homely, abounding in Scriptural phraseology and in illustrations from common life. Penn says of him, 'He was a discerner of other men's spirits and very much master of his own; above all he excelled in prayer. . . . The most awful reverent frame I ever felt or heard was his in prayer.'[3]

He spoke with such an intense spiritual vitality that some thought he was an angel or spirit which suddenly had come to declare the wonderful things of God; others, like the minister at Woodkirk, "believed that Fox carried bottles about with him which bewitched people into following him and rode a great black horse which spirited him away threescore miles in a moment."[4] Dressed in leathern breeches and doublet and wearing a white hat, Fox created quite a stir wherever he appeared; at some places "the people would ring the Bells when wee came into a town thinking I would speak" and sometimes the paid priests, whom he denounced as "hirelings," fled from town whenever they heard that the man in leathern breeches was come.[5] Passing through Holderness he, like another John the Baptist, preached

1. Fox, Short Journal, pp. 4-5.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 259.
3. Elbert Russell, The History of Quakerism (New York: Macmillan Co., 1942), 28.
4. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 67.
5. Fox, Short Journal, pp. 13-14.

the coming of the Day of the Lord; at Wakefield "the people said that he and his companions made more noise in the country than the coming up of the Scottish army."[1] Once when a man offered him some money, Fox shook his hand at it and bade him "mind the lord, and Christ the teacher in him, for hee was comeing to bring them off of all ye worlds teachers, and the lord would teach his people himselfe."[2] At Kendale Markett, Fox says, he was moved to throw the silver in his pocket

> out amongst y^e People as I was going up the street before I spoke, and my life was offer's upp amongst them, and the mighty power of y^e lord was seen p^rserving and the power of y^e lord was so mighty and so strong, y^t people flew before and runne into y^e shopps for fear and terror took hold upon them, I was moved to open my mouth and lift upp my voyce aloud in the mighty power of the lord; and to tell y^m the mighty day of y^e lord was coming upon all deceitfull Merchaundize and wayes, and to call y^m all to repentance and a turning to the lord God, and his spirit w^thin them for it to teach them and lead them and tremple before y^e mighty God of heaven and earth, for his mighty day was comeing; and so passed through the streets, and when I came to y^e townes end, I gote upon a stumpp and spoke to y^e people, and so y^e People begane to fight some for mee, and some against mee, and so after a while I passed away w^thout any harme.[3]

Coming among the Westmorland Seekers, Fox declared that the temple with its priests and tithes was now ended and that Christ, their Teacher, was come to dwell within them. "With prophetic authority," Fox answered the hopes and yearnings of these people; Braithwaite says that "under the influence of half-a-dozen powerful meetings and of the personal intercourse with Fox enjoyed by his hosts and their friends, a great company was gathered in."[4] Howgill gives this description of the wonder and joy which they experienced upon Fox's coming into their midst:

> 'The Kingdom of Heaven did gather us, and catch us all, as in a net and His heavenly power at one time drew many hundreds to land, that we came to know a place to stand in and what to wait in, and the

1. Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 67-68.
2. Fox, Short Journal, p. 16.
3. Ibid., pp. 21-22.
4. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 86.

> Lord appeared daily to us, to our astonishment, amazement, and great admiration, insomuch that we often said one unto another, with great joy of heart, "What? Is the Kingdom of God come to be with men? And will He take up His tabernacle among the sons of men, as He did of old? And what? Shall we, that were reckoned as the outcasts of Israel, have this honour of glory communicated amongst us, which were but men of small parts, and of little abilities in respect of many others, as amongst men?"[1]

Howgill tells us that their hearts were knit to another as they entered in the covenant of life with God; Braithwaite says, Burrough speaks of their meeting to wait upon the Lord

> in pure silence from their own words and from all men's words, their sense of the word of the Lord in their hearts, burning up and beating down all that was contrary to God, and their baptism with the Spirit, making their hearts glad and loosing their tongues. The new experience brought with it a fresh glow of spiritual life and a fresh fervour of fellowship, which filled men with wonder and joy. The fellowship of Pentecost and the fraternal joys of the early Franciscans were reproduced among the simple-hearted 'statesmen' of Westmorland.[2]

Passing through Furness and Staneley, Fox came to Ulverston where Margaret Fell of Swarthmore heard him declare that the Scriptures are but words which the prophets and apostles had from the Lord and ask what can we ourselves say of the Spirit. Cut to the heart, Margaret Fell sat down in her pew and cried bitterly, 'We are all thieves . . . we have taken the scriptures in words, and know nothing of them in ourselves.'[3] Afterwards, Swarthmore Hall, under its fervent mistress, became the unofficial headquarters not only for Fox, but also for the other Quaker apostles who joined him in publishing the Truth.[4]

Not only did George Fox convert men to the truth he proclaimed but he also stirred many of them to preach it. Margaret Fell counted twenty-four preachers who came out of Westmorland, Furness and north

1. Ut per Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 95-96.
2. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 96.
3. Ibid., p. 101.
4. Vide Russell, op. cit., p. 32, Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 104.

Lancashire before the middle of 1653.[1] Braithwaite says that most of these "First Publishers of Truth" were "men of competent Bible knowledge and religious training" who had advanced in religious experience far beyond the doctrines and professions which had satisfied others in their day; for the most part they were "young men in the prime of their ardour and strength."[2] A few examples of the calling which these men received will be of interest to us. In October 1652, William Dewsbury was called to leave wife and children and "'to run to and fro to declare to souls where their Teacher is—the light in their consciences;'" fifty years later, people were telling that "'his testimony was piercing and very powerful, so as the earth shook before him.'"[3] To the magistrate who asked about his call to preach, James Nayler replied:

> 'I was at the plough, meditating on the things of God, and suddenly I heard a Voice, saying unto me, "Get thee out from thy kindred and from thy father's house." And I had a promise given in with it. Whereupon I did exceedingly rejoice, that I had heard the Voice of that God which I had professed from a child, but had never known him.
>
> Col. Briggs. 'Didst thou hear that Voice?
>
> Nayler. 'Yes, I did hear it, and when I came at home, I gave up my estate and cast out my money, but, not being obedient in going forth, the wrath of God was upon me, so that I was made a wonder to all, and none thought I would have lived. But, after I was made willing, [Braithwaite conjectures that Nayler's talk with Fox came at this point], I began to make some preparation, as apparel and other necessaries, not knowing whither I should go, but, shortly afterward, going agateward with a friend from my own house, having on an old suit, without any money, having neither taken leave of wife or children, not thinking then of any journey, I was commanded to go into the west, not knowing whither I should go, nor what I was to do there, but, when I had been there a little while, I had given me what I was to declare, and ever since I have remained, not knowing to-day what I was to do to-morrow.
>
> Col. Briggs. 'What was the promise that thou hadst given?
>
> Nayler. 'That God would be with me, which promise I find made good every day.
>
> Col. Briggs. 'I never heard such a call as this is in our time.
>
> Nayler. 'I believe thee.'[4]

1. Ut per Elizabeth Braithwaite Emmott, A Short History of Quakersim (London: Swarthmore Press, 1823), 33.
2. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 94.
3. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 73-74.
4. Ut per Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 87-89.

Howgill and Audland were ministers when they met Fox, but at his message all their profession became as nothing; experiencing a new conviction and a new mission, they returned the money which they had received from their parishes and joined the band of wandering preachers. As a boy of nineteen, Edward Burrough already had passed through the conservative stages of Puritanism and had begun to have "openings of truth" when he met Fox; upon his renouncing the world and becoming a Quaker, he was disowned by his family and friends as he "threw himself with single-hearted devotion into the pioneer work of the Quaker movement."[1] As a lecturer at Richmond, Thomas Taylor went to see Fox at Swarthmore in September of 1652 and was so convinced that as he preached the next day "a tender pring of life sprang up in him;" giving up his benefice, he trusted the Lord to provide for himself and his family as he undertook to go forth in the name of the Lord.[2]

Like the itinerant Baptist preachers,[3] these and the other first Quaker publishers moved from town to town, preaching as they had opportunity. Generally going forth in pairs, after the manner of the seventy, they placed great importance upon the travelling as one of the distinctive practices of the apostles; Nayler condemned Baxter as a false minister because he did not travel. Thomas Pollard, a minister in Leichfield retorted by charging Fox's preachers with neglecting their trades and wandering idly over the country.[4] Judge Atkins reminded Dewsbury that even the apostles had worked with their hands; to which, Dewsbury replied that when the apostles were called to the ministry they left their callings

1. Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 90-91.
2. Ibid., p. 93.
3. Vide Barclay, op. cit., pp. 353-354 for this comparison.
4. Barclay, op. cit., pp. 379-380.

'to follow Christ whither he led them by his Spirit' and that he and his fellow-prisoners were only following their example.[1] However, Dewsbury was not ashamed to make shoe-laces while he was in prison,[2] and later Farnsworth was to warn against those who went about in idleness and thought themselves above manual labor.[3] The Quaker preachers had no prejudice against receiving voluntary offerings for their ministry; Barclay says,

> It is a great mistake . . . to suppose that Fox, in protesting against a 'hireling ministry,' protested against all payments to ministers of the Gospel. What he opposed, was a ministry which was the creature of the civil power, and hired by it. His views were precisely the same as those of many, probably of a great majority, of the Independents and Baptists of that day.[4]

In 1653 Fox declared that men ought to be willing to minister of their carnal things unto those who minister unto them spiritual things, and in 1659 Hubberthorne stated the Quaker position even more clearly:

> 'Let every one that will preach the gospel live of the gospel, and not upon any settled or State maintenance . . . for the cry of the honest and godly people of this nation is to have a free ministry and free maintenance, and are willing freely to maintain those that minister unto them the word and doctrine.'[5]

Margaret Fell took a leading part in contributing and in raising money for the frugal needs of the early Publishers of Truth, and through her efforts something of a systematic plan was worked out to supplement the hospitality and gifts which they received from the people who heard their message.[6] Barclay says that there is evidence that these preachers did not wander throughout England "impelled by a vague and restless impulse of the Spirit, without any human guidance, organization or distinct aim;" from the early

1. Masson, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 67-68.
2. Vide Emmott, op. cit., p. 110.
3. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 137.
4. Barclay, op. cit., p. 270.
5. Ut per Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 136.
6. Vide Barclay, op. cit., pp. 347-348.

records, Barclay says, we find that

> preachers were supplied for congregations; that they were displaced or 'called in'— were sent to particular places where their gifts were specially likely to be useful. We find all the features of a well-organized system of itinerant lay preaching, something similar to that of the Wesleyans at the present day.[1]

George Fox occupied a unique position among his preachers and exerted a tremendous influence over them; like a bishop, he directed, assigned and encouraged them. In 1653, Thomas Goodyear wrote to Fox:

> 'I desire thee (if thou in thy wisdom find it meet so to do) to send up some Friend who is in the life and power of Truth, about two weeks hence, up to Swanington, then the day after the day called Christmas day, that I may have the liberty of returning, if but for a time; to thy discretion I leave it.'[2]

Also in 1653 Thomas Holmes wrote to Margaret Fell that "'George hath sent for me to pass among Friends where he hath been in Leicestershire and Warwickshire;'" Thomas Killam and Thomas Goodair wrote to George Fox in the same year, "'Tender and careful Brother, according to the charge thou laid upon me, I have been at Coventry. . . .'"[3] Also in 1653 J. Nayler wrote to Margaret Fell that in Cleveland

> 'the people would meet in every place, had they but any to watch over them . . . I should be glad to see Francis Howgill, or John Audland here, or Thomas Goodair if George was free to send for him he might be serviceable to meet with them, and would keep them together till they were established.'[4]

The converts of these preachers were gathered into communities or societies very similar to the Independents and Baptists, without taking a Covenant or receiving baptism. Barclay says,

> In the time of the Commonwealth it would seem that the public meetings of the Society were conducted almost entirely on the model of the Baptist and Independent Meetings, and that certain meetings of the Church, corresponding with what would be now called 'prayer meetings,'

1. Barclay, op. cit., pp. 339-340.
2. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., pp. 340-341.
3. Ibid., p. 341.
4. Ibid., p. 342.

were occasionally held with a large amount of silent prayer.[1] As early as 1652 Dewsbury had settled a General Meeting once in three weeks in the East Riding of Yorkshire; in an early letter Farnsworth names the leaders of the General Meeting and urges them to "'observe the order.'"[2] Braithwaite suggests that these instructions may be connected with an important letter signed by Fox and Dewsbury in March 1653/4.

> It is the word of the living God to His Church that in each meeting there should be chosen 'one or two who are the most grown in the power and life,' who shall take the care and charge over the flock of God in that place. These Friends, to whom no name is given, were to see that a meeting was held, 'according to the rule that hath been given forth,' once a week or oftener, in addition to the first-day meeting, and that a General Meeting was held with other Friends in the district once in two or three weeks. They were also to watch over one another to see that those who came among Friends walked orderly, according to their Christian profession, and if any walked disorderly, they or other discerning Friends were to deal plainly with them, so as 'to raise up the witness, to judge and cut down the deceit, that their souls may be saved.' . . . Further, the Friends chosen to watch over the flock were to see that there were none in outward want in the Church, and that all walked orderly in their places and callings, and when any differences arose they were to judge between Friends and end it in righteousness, with help, if necessary, from other Friends of discernment.[3]

In addition to the travelling ministers (who, like the early apostles, planted churches, ordained officers, defended the truth and travelled up and down to perform the work), the Quakers thus came to have resident ministers or elders to serve as pastors to a particular congregation.[4] Fox writes that in 1653 "'many of the Elders came to me at Swarthmore in Lancashire, and desired that they might have a Monthly Meeting to look after the poor and to see that all walked according to the Truth.'"[5]

1. Barclay, op. cit., p. 399. The 'silent meeting' was introduced to the Bristol Church in 1678 as something new.
2. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 140.
3. Ibid., pp. 140-141. (Vide Dewsbury's Works, pp. 1-4).
4. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 142-143 for the close analogies between the Quakers and the General Baptists.
5. Ut per Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 143.

Braithwaite concludes:

> When we have said that the first organization of Friends in the North of England depended on spiritual leadership, exercised by the apostles of the movement and the itinerating Publishers of Truth, and locally through Elders and the meetings which they arranged, we have gone as far in the way of definite statement as seems possible.[1]

The second great extension of the Quaker Movement began in 1654, when the Lord raised up and sent "'a matter of seventy ministers . . . abroad out of the North Countries.'"[2] When these preachers first came to London, the word quickly spread "'that there was a sort of people come there that went by the name of plain North Country plowmen, who did differ in judgment to all other people in that city.'"[3] Cromwell received two of them who found the Protector "'too wise in comprehension and too high in notion to receive Truth in plainness and demonstration of the Spirit;'" dressed in a plain rough coat, Cromwell offered them money or anything else they needed, but he argued for an established church and pleaded for "'every man's liberty and none to disturb another.'"[4] Later two women distributed tracts throughout the city, and Burrough and Howgill debated in the Independent and Baptist meetings; by the end of July, Pearson noted that "some deep ploughing had been done by the plain North-countrymen," and that a great harvest was likely to come in London.[5] In Bristol, Camm and Audland met with even greater response; a company of Seekers readily befriended them and at first the Baptist and other Independents cordially received them; when the ministers became alarmed at the excitement which they were causing, the soldiers befriended them. Elsewhere in the South, the Publishers of Truth were not so well received; at Oxford a Quaker

1. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 144.
2. Fox ut per Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 155.
3. Ut per Russell, op. cit., p. 34.
4. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 155-156.
5. Ibid., p. 161.

girl was whipped for going naked through the streets as a sign that the Lord would strip off the hypocritical profession from the Presbyterians and Independents; Whitehead was imprisoned at Norwich for creating a disturbance in the church.[1] Barclay says that these "early preachers preached Bible in hand" and that the sum of their message was that Christ offers salvation to all men and that after they believe, "'they are sealed with the Spirit of promise, and know that Christ the substance is come, and dwelleth in His people by His Spirit.'"[2] They denounced the hypocrisy of their day and upheld "a standard of thorough-going Christian truthfulness, and the carrying out the spirit of Christianity in daily conduct;" they declared that the Bible was not to be used "'to dispute by, but to live by.'" These preachers

> used rough-and-ready illustrations in their preaching, and spoke plain truths to plain people, and 'thundered' everywhere against sin, appealing to men's consciences in a way which Latin and Greek quotations, and elaborate sermons in the dry Puritan style could never do.[3]

By the spring of 1655 the work in the South was progressing so well that other workers were called from the North; Burrough and Howgill wrote to Fox, "'Let Alex (i.e. Alexander Parker) come to help us, lest our net break.'"[4] Passing through London which had become something of a headquarters to give them assignments and supplies, John Stubbs and Caton went towards Dover, Richard Clayton and Thomas Bond into Suffolk, Thomas Salthouse and Miles Halhead towards Plymouth, John Slee and Thomas Lawson into Sussex, Robertson and Ambrose Rigge into Surrey and Kent, Thomas Stubbs and Lancaster into Bedfordshire.[5] At Kidderminster Thomas Goodair

1. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 164 ff. for other accounts.
2. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., p. 302.
3. Ibid., pp. 303-305 passim.
4. Ibid., p. 346.
5. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 185-186.

and James Nayler encountered the vigilant Baxter who replied to their question of his authority to preach by offering to show them his commission if they would show theirs; when they said that theirs was 'invisible,' the sharp pastor retorted, 'why may you not take the answer that you give?' When they accused him of 'studied' sermons, Baxter exclaimed;

> 'I pray God forgive me that I study no more. Do you think we cannot talk without study, as well as you? . . . Does the Spirit exclude reason and prudence, and set a man's tongue going so that he cannot stop it? . . . If all have the light, why may not I have it?'[1]

Barclay says that in debating with "the most practised logician in England they were clearly over-matched;"[2] however, Baxter was not above repeating common gossip against them; in Reliquiae Baxterianae, he says, "Many Franciscan Fryers and other Papists, have been proved to be disguised Speakers in their Assemblies, and to be among them."[3] It was sometimes rumored that the Quakers were involved in plots against the government, and the authorities became watchful over the large number of wandering preachers. In February 1655, Fox was arrested and brought to London where in an interview with Cromwell he was able to clear the Friends from the wild rumors current about them and to satisfy Cromwell in the matter of plots; Fox relates that Cromwell told him that he might go wherever he would and bade him to come again to his house.[4] Masson says that Cromwell tried to make a difference between what the Quakers professed and the actual disturbances which they caused; for offenses against the peace they were jailed and whipped, but he often interceded for those who were suffering only for their faith; 'making a difference' (Jude v. 22) was

1. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., pp. 329-330. Vide Baxter, One Sheet Against the Quakers.
2. Barclay, op. cit., p. 331.
3. Reliquiae Baxterianae, p. 77.
4. Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 180.

Cromwell's rule in cases where toleration was impossible, and "he does not seem to have been able to do more for the Quakers."[1]

Nayler's defection in 1656 seriously endangered Cromwell's precious toleration and "was the signal for a widespread and vigorous attack on Friends."[2] As one of Fox's first helpers, James Nayler came to rival Fox in influence, but he "lacked the sanity and self-control which underlay the eccentricities of his leader, and was carried away by the emotional enthusiasm which his preaching roused."[3] Firth says that men saw in his features a resemblance to the traditional portraits of Christ, which he artificially heightened by the arrangement of his hair and beard; he became a new messiah to his excited followers who staged a triumphal entry into Bristol for him. His case stirred Parliament to threaten an act suppressing all Quakers. Men, like Colonel Sydenham, arose, not to defend the Quakers as such but to safe-guard toleration itself; the word Quaker, he said, signifies nothing;

> 'it is like the word Lollards or Puritans, under the notion whereof many godly persons are now under the Altar, their blood being poured forth. It is of dangerous consequence to make a law under general terms, and leave it to after ages to interpret your meaning. Let it be plainly explained what the offences shall be.'[4]

Major-General Skippon, whom Firth describes as "a typical Presbyterian," declared that the growth of blasphemies and heresies was more dangerous than foreign enemies; "'I have often been troubled in my thoughts to think of this toleration.'" Major-General Boteler, "a typical Independent" said

1. Masson, op. cit., vol. V, p. 69. Braithwaite says Cromwell "was a sincere upholder of religious liberty, but the unsettlement of the nation compelled him to insist that it should be a liberty within the limits of good order." (op. cit., p. 180).

2. Russell, op. cit., p.81. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 64-66 for the case of John Biddle, which Masson describes as "the crucial test of Cromwell's Toleration."

3. Charles Harding Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate 1656-1658 (2 vols., London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909), I, 84-85.

4. Ut per Firth, Protectorate, vol. I, pp. 94-95.

that it was "'not intended to indulge such gross heresies and blasphemies as these, under the notion of a toleration of tender consciences.'"[1] Joshua Sprigge, a former army chaplain, led a deputation to plead that Nayler's horrible sentence be stayed, but they pleaded in vain against 'God's executioners.' John Owen, William Prynne, Samuel Clarke, Richard Baxter denounced the Quakers as being dangerous to society; John Bunyan's first writing was directed against them.[2] Masson says that "the very name Quakerism became a synonym for all that was intolerable."[3] In a letter to the Protector, Monck described the Quakers in the army as "'a very dangerous people'" who were "'neither fit to command nor obey;'" Firth says that during 1657 all the regiments in Scotland were thoroughly purged of them.[4] After Nayler's fall the itinerant preachers met with increasing hostility; the tenderness which they formerly had found in many was now hardened against them. Cromwell's proclamation (Feb. 15, 1654/5) prohibiting the disturbance of religious meetings was often used against them, and the Vagrancy Act, which was extended in 1657 to include all persons wandering about or travelling without sufficient cause, was often made the excuse for their arrest.[5] Many of the Quaker leaders came to feel that greater care should be taken in the sending out of preachers and that a stricter control of them was necessary. In an undated letter, Edward Burrough says to Fox:

> 'I lie it upon thee, that none go forth but when the life (of Christianity) is manifested, and wisdom is grown to discern and order. For some hath been here, and we hear of some in our passage in Lancashire, which gives great occasion, and makes the truth evil spoken of, and we have the worse passage.'

1. Ut per Firth, Protectorate, pp. 96-97.
2. Vide Russell, op. cit., p. 81.
3. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 66-69.
4. Firth, Cromwell's Army, pp. 344-345.
5. Russell, op. cit., p. 62. Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 180-181.

In this same letter, Burrough speaks of those who had been causes of stumbling and adds, "'Call them in when they come out of prison.'"[1] In 1656 Burrough sends this note to Fox with one of the women preachers:

> 'This little short maid that comes to thee, she has been this long while abroad, and in her there is little or no service as in the ministry. It were well to be laid on her to be a servant somewhere. That is more her place. I leave it to thee. Friends where she has been have been burdened by her.'[2]

Likewise William Dewsbury returned Elizabeth Coates to her home and bade her to wait; "'take heed of forwardness lest thou lavish in words what thou seest in vision.'"[3] It seems that others began to question the wisdom of sending out any preachers to travel about; at a General Meeting at Birkhagg when Howgill and Burrough reported on their work in Ireland and Audland spoke of the preaching in Bristol, Robert Collinson arose and said that their words were without life and power and that they ought to stay at home and be silent instead of idling up and down the country.[4] While the fervor remained in the hearts of many, for others it was not as fresh as it was at first; the Kingdom which had seemed so near began to recede. Many of the First Publishers had exhausted themselves, and those who took their places were of a different type. At the Yearly Meeting in Bedfordshire (May 1658), Fox cautioned against long addresses and against travelling about except as moved of the Lord; emphasizing the importance of the ministry, he said,

> 'It is a mighty thing to be in the work of the ministry of the Lord God and to go forth in that; for it is not as a customary preaching but to bring people to the end of all preaching.'[5]

In this same speech he spoke of the high ideal which he cherished for the

1. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., pp. 344-345.
2. Ibid., p. 345.
3. Ibid.
4. Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 345-346.
5. Ut per Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 353-354.

Quaker fellowship:

> 'Now Truth hath an honour in the hearts of people which are not Friends, so that all Friends being kept in the Truth they are kept in the honour, they are honourable and that will honour them: but if ye lose the power, ye lose the life, they lose their crown, they lose their honour, they lose the cross which should crucify them, and they crucify the just, and, by losing the power, the Lamb comes to be slain.'[1]

Fox was in London during the summer of 1658, and on August 20th he was going to Hampton Court to plead "about the sufferings of Friends" when he saw the Protector riding at the head of his guards. Cromwell had lost Elizabeth Claypole, his daughter, a few weeks before and had been ill of a fever afterwards; Fox says, "'Before I came to him, I saw and felt a waft of death go forth against him, and when I came to him he looked like a dead man.'"[2]

1. Ut per Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 353-354.
2. Ut per Firth, Cromwell, p. 441.

CHAPTER NINE

THE DECLINE OF LAY-PREACHING
(1660-1738)

I. THE RESTORATION
   A. Political situation
   B. Problem of church settlement
   C. Impulsive actions
   D. Bunyan's defense

II. THE PERSECUTION
   A. "The Clarendon Code"
   B. "The Judgments"
   C. The Quakers
   D. The Baptists

III. A PRECARIOUS TOLERATION
   A. Charles II's indulgence
   B. The fear of the restoration of Papacy
   C. Renewed persecution
   D. "The Glorious Revolution"

IV. A CONDITIONED TOLERATION
   A. The settlement of 1689
   B. Reaction under Queen Anne

V. GENERAL RELIGIOUS DECLINE
   A. Decline of religious interest
   B. The state of nonconformity
   C. Baptist changes
   D. Quaker developments
   E. Efforts toward revival

On September 3, 1658, Richard Cromwell was left at the head of a silent and stunned nation; a few days later Thurloe wrote to Henry Cromwell in Ireland that his brother had had "'a very easy and peaceable entrance upon his government'" but that there were "'some secret murmurings in the army, as if his Highness were not general of the army, as his father was.'"[1] By the end of October these secret murmurings had become a signed petition that a soldier be appointed Commander-in-chief; Henry Cromwell rebuked his brother-in-law Fleetwood for his part in gathering "'those 200 or 300 officers together'" in a meeting where "'dirt was thrown upon his late Highness'" and where they "were exhorted to stand up for that 'good old cause which had long lain asleep.'"[2] A Court Party formed around Richard, and a new Parliament was summoned to strengthen his position. When the army demanded that Fleetwood be appointed Lord General of the army and raised to equal status with Richard, Parliament prohibited any further meetings of army officers; the officers defied this order and decided, in Fleetwood's quarters at Wallingford, that Parliament should be dissolved.[3] In abhorrence of shedding blood, Richard declined to summon the armies from Ireland and Scotland and signed the order dissolving Parliament. In the meantime the forces which Fleetwood and Desborough had let loose got out of their control; the Fifth Monarchists and republicans re-emerged to denounce the Protectorate, and in May (1659), the 'year of anarchy' began.[4] Upon the abdication of Richard, the army officers were forced to recall the Purged Parliament which,

1. Ut per Tanner, op. cit., p. 201.
2. Ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. V, pp. 423-425.
3. Vide Reliquiae Baxterianae, p. 101, for Dr. Owen's part in this decision.
4. Vide Tanner, op. cit., pp. 204-205.

instead of discontinuing the tithes, ordered that the Solemn League and Covenant be read in every church. On October 13th, Lambert and his troops expelled its members; Mrs. Hutchinson says,

> this insolent usurpation of Lambert's so turned the hearts of all men, that the whole nation began to set their eyes upon the king beyond the sea, and think a bad settlement under him better than none at all, but still to be under the arbitrary power of such proud rebels as Lambert.[1]

On January 2, 1660, Monck marched his army across the Tweed "'to assert the liberty and authority of Parliament;'"[2] Fairfax welcomed him at York, and Lambert's disheartened army disintegrated before him; riots broke out in London, and when he entered the Capitol City (Feb. 3, 1660), men rejoiced at this deliverance from "the Usurpation of the Fanaticks."[3] Monck restored the Purged Parliament which dissolved itself (March 16, 1660) and called for a new Parliament. Masson says that in April "the popular current towards a restoration of Charles Stuart and nothing else" acquired such "a roaring and foaming torrent" that only its date and manner was left to the Parliament,[4] which took its seat at Westminister on April 25, 1660 and almost immediately began to consider Charles' Declaration of Breda. Amnesty was promised to all persons who claimed it within forty days, "excepting only such persons as shall hereafter be excepted by Parliament;" Parliament was authorized to settle all disputed lands and property and a "full satisfaction of all arrears" was promised to those under General Monck.[5] Of the settlement of religion, Charles wrote:

> . . . because the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other (which, when they shall

1. Hutchinson, Memoirs, vol. II, p. 235.
2. Ut per Tanner, op. cit., p. 207.
3. Reliquiae Baxterianae, p. 214.
4. Masson, op. cit., vol. V, p. 666.
5. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 465-467.

> hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation, will be composed or better understood), we do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament, as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us, for the full granting that indulgence.[1]

Upon the acceptance of the king's declaration, Parliament voted that "'according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this kingdom, the government is and ought to be by King, Lords, and Commons,'" and joined in the preparation for the king's return.[2] On May 25, 1660, Charles II stepped onto English soil and four days later was received in London

> 'with a triumph of above twenty thousand horse and foot, brandishing their swords and shouting with inexpressible joy; the ways strewed with flowers, the bells ringing, the streets hung with tapestry, the fountains running with wine.'[2]

Some men wondered whether they were in England or not as the people changed tunes with the poets and joined in "one wild fit of cheerful folly" to end the "twenty years of dismal melancholy."[3] Burnet says that with the king's return "a spirit of extra-vagrant joy spread over the nation, that brought on with it the throwing off the very professions of vertue and piety;"

> Under the colour of drinking the King's health, there were great disorders and much riot everywhere: and the pretences of religion, both in those of the hypocritical sort, and of the most honest but less pernicious enthusiasts, gave great advantages, as well as furnished much matter, to the prophane mockers of true piety.

Burnet says that those who had been involved in "the former transactions" thought that the surest way to redeem themselves from all censure was "by going into the stream, and laughing at all religion, telling or making stories to expose both themselves and their party as impious and redicu-

1. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 466.
2. Evelyn, ut per Firth, Cromwell, p. 449.
3. A. Cowley, "Ode upon the Blessed Restoration." Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 13-14, Tanner, op. cit., p. 209.

lous."[1]

During his exile abroad Charles II had kept up the English service in his chapel, and the Presbyterian ministers who had called on him at the Hague were impressed by his prayers which they overheard. Before his return he included several Puritan ministers (including Baxter) in his appointment of chaplains. For a time it looked as if he might follow Baxter's advice not "to undo the good which Cromwell or any other had done because they were usurpers that did it, or discountenance a faithful ministry because his enemies had set them up."[2] He released Fox from prison and told Hubberthorne that he had 'the word of a king' that none should suffer for their opinions in religion as long as they lived peaceably.[3] In the latter part of 1660, there was a great hope of a liberal toleration outside the established Church and a liberal comprehension within it. The Presbyterians seemed willing to accept a modified Episcopacy wherein bishops would be presidents of presbyteries and there would be a toleration in litany and ceremonies; Clarendon (Hyde) himself seemed at one time to favor such a plan, but the king favored a larger toleration outside the church than a comprehension within it. On October 22, 1660 when the king's Declaration of Indulgence was read to a meeting of the religious parties, Baxter says that they all saw it would secure liberty for the Papists; the Presbyterians waited for the bishops to speak. At last Baxter broke the silence by referring to Dr. Gunning's mention of the sects (the Papists and the Socinians), and by saying that they must distinguish the tolerable parties from the intolerable.

> For the former, we humbly crave just lenity and favour; but for the latter, such as the two sorts named before by the Reverend

1. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, p. 93.
2. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. II, pp. 230-231.
3. Braithwaite, op. cit., pp. 476-477.

> Brother, for our parts we cannot make their Toleration our request: To which his Majesty said, That there were Laws enough against the Papists; and I replyed, That we understood the Question to be, whether those Laws should be executed on them, or not. And so his Majesty broke up the Meeting of that Day.[1]

Tanner says that this policy of the king's granting religious liberty to Papists and sectaries alike "wrecked the chances of limited episcopacy, for Anglicans and Presbyterians were both opposed to it."[2] However, for a time the king favored the Puritan proposals and offered several bishoprics to Presbyterian ministers; but on November 28th when his modified Bill of Indulgence was introduced in Commons, his supporters defeated it.[3] On March 25, 1661, Charles called for a conference between the Anglican clergymen and the Conservative Puritans (mostly Presbyterians);[4] when they assembled (April 15th) at Savoy it soon became obvious that neither side had changed their position since Hampton Court. Hutton says that the bishops

> assumed the position of rulers of the Church, prepared to entertain all serious objections, and fully competent to decide upon them. It was a claim which absolutely conflicted with the presumed equality between the parties with which the conference was supposed to have begun. The popular feeling was so evident that the bishops found themselves able to assert their old authority, and skilfull assistants supported them.[4]

Upon the breakdown of this conference, the Puritan ministers petitioned the king that none be punished for not using the Prayer Book, but the king could no longer promise anything; for some men were not waiting for the decision of councils or conferences, and in their haste were shaping their own settlement.

As early as May 12, 1660, a minister wrote in his parish register:

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. II, p. 277.
2. Tanner, op. cit., p. 227.
3. Dale, op. cit., pp. 400-401.
4. Vide Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 588-594.

on this day, "'I, Stephen Hogg, began to use again the Book of Common Prayer.'"[1] On November 12, 1660, John Bunyan was arrested for preaching at Samsell in Bedfordshire; as Dr. Brown points out, at that time no new law had been enacted and the justice acted "in unnecessary haste and shown an uncalled-for zeal."[2] When Mr. Wingate, the justice-of-peace, asked Bunyan why he did not content himself with following his own calling instead of creating disorder and confusion, Bunyan replied that he found no confusion in exhorting men to believe Christ in addition to his work as a tinker. When sureties were offered on the condition that he would stop preaching, Bunyan declined them saying:

> I should not leave speaking the word of God—even to counsel, comfort, exhort, and teach the people among whom I came; and I thought this to be a work that had no hurt in it, but was rather worthy of commendation than blame.[3]

When Dr. Lindale asked him to show his warrant for preaching, Bunyan cited the Scriptures (I Peter 4:10, I Cor. 14:30), and when Mr. Foster accused him of being "the nearest the papists" in understanding the Scriptures literally, Bunyan replied that

> those that were to be understood literally we understood them so; but that those that were to be understood otherwise, we endeavoured so to understand them.
>
> He said, which of the scriptures do you understand literally?
>
> I said this, 'He that believeth shall be saved.' This was to be understood just as it is spoken—that whosoever believeth in Christ, shall, according to the plain and simple words of the text, be saved.[4]

To Foster's scorn of his ignorance of the original Greek, Bunyan replied that if only those who understood Greek were to be saved then there would

1. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., p. 181.
2. Vide Brown, Bunyan, pp. 133-134. Although the anti-conventicle proclamation (Jan. 10, 1661) was later brought against him, it had not been in effect in November 1660 when he was arrested.
3. John Bunyan, "The Relation of My Imprisonment in the Month of November, 1660," Works, vol. IV, pp. 479-480.
4. Ibid.

be few indeed; to Foster's accusation that he made people neglect their work, Bunyan replied that it was the people's duty to look out for their souls on weekdays as well as on Sunday and that God would have his people exhort one another daily.

> He said again, that there was none but a company of poor simple ignorant people that came to hear me.
> I told him that the foolish and the ignorant had most need of teaching and information; and therefore it would be profitable for me to go on in that work.
> Well, said he, to conclude, but will you promise that you will not call the people together any more? and then you may be released and go home.
> I told him that I durst say no more than I had said; for I durst not leave off that work which God had called me to.[1]

While Bunyan was lying in prison awaiting trial, others took matters into their hands. On January 6, 1661, Thomas Venner, "a violent fifth-monarchy man" led a group of his followers out from their meeting-place in Coleman Street and marched with prepared standards towards St. Paul's, shouting, "No King but Christ;" Burnet says that some of them thought Christ would come down to lead them while the people stood amazed at "this piece of extravagance."[2] Well armed, this group of men scattered the hastily aroused militia and after marching through the streets bivouached near Hampstead where they were attacked and dispersed the next morning by some of Monck's cavalrymen. Masson says that about twenty soldiers and citizens had been killed in this riot which caused the Royalists to fear a general uprising; the mails were searched, and sixty-six people were apprehended.[3] On January 10th the king issued a proclamation "restraining all unlawful and seditious meetings and conventicles under pretence of religious worship, and forbidding any meetings for worship except in

1. Bunyan, Works, vol. IV, pp. 481-482.
2. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, p. 160.
3. Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 120.

parochial churches or chapels." The Congregationalists, Baptists and Quakers hastened to declare their abhorrence of Venner's rebellion,[1] but that did not prevent the disruption of their services and the imprisonment of thousands of Quakers and Baptists.[2]

Richard Ireland, "a member of the Baptized People," tried to defend the preaching of laboring men in a pamphlet None fit to preach the gospel but the learned (1661), but it seems no one troubled to answer this last plaintive cry of a great debate; the issue was being settled another way. When the Bedford tinker confessed that he had had meetings to pray to God and to exhort others, Justice Keelin pronounced this judgment upon him:

> You must be had back again to prison, and there lie for three months following; and at three months' end, if you do not submit to go to church to hear divine service, and leave your preaching, you must be banished the realm: and if, after such a day as shall be appointed you to be gone, you shall be found in this realm, &c., or be found to come over again without special license from the king, &c., you must stretch by the neck for it, I tell you plainly.[3]

On April 3, 1661, Mr. Cobb, the clerk of the peace, came into Bunyan's cell to persuade him to submit to the law and to leave off those meetings which he was "wont to have." When Cobb told him that at the next session of court he may be sent out of the country, Bunyan bravely answered that he hoped that he would be able to conduct himself as a man and a Christian; claiming that the recent law did not reach him as he had not used the exercise of religion as a pretence to cover wickedness, Bunyan said,

> my end in meeting with others is simply to do as much good as I can, by exhortation and counsel, according to small measure of light which God hath given me.[4]

1. Vide Underwood, op. cit., pp. 93-94; Russell, op. cit., p. 90.
2. Vide Braithwaite, op. cit., p. 512; Crosby, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 91-92.
3. Bunyan, Works, vol. IV, p. 484.
4. Ibid., p. 485.

When Cobb replied that everyone, even the late insurrectionists of London, would say the same, Bunyan professed that he abhorred their practice and yet did not understand why their misconduct should cause others to be prohibited. "You may have your liberty to exhort your neighbour in private discourse . . . and truly you may do much good to the church of Christ, if you you would go this way," said Mr. Cobb; Bunyan asked if he may do good to one by his discourse, why may he not do good to two or more? Cobb replied, "You may but pretend to do good, and, indeed, notwithstanding, do harm by seducing the people." Bunyan answers that he may seduce one yet the law does not forbid him to discourse with his neighbor because of that fear; the law ("35th of Elizabeth") opposes only those who meet under the pretence of religion to do mischief. When Cobb asked him if he thought himself so well enlightened that he could not learn from other men's preaching, Bunyan told him

> I was as willing to be taught as to give instruction, and I looked upon it as my duty to do both; for said I, a man that is a teacher, he himself may learn also from another that teacheth, as the apostle saith: 'We may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn.' That is, every man that hath received a gift from God, he may dispense it, that others may be comforted; and when he hath done, he may hear, and learn, and be comforted himself of others.
>
> Cobb. But, said he, what if you should forbear awhile, and sit still, till you see further how things will go?
>
> Bun. Sir, said I, Wickliffe saith, that he which leaveth off preaching and hearing of the word of God for fear of excommunication of men, he is already excommunicated of God, and shall in the day of judgment be counted a traitor to Christ.
>
> Cobb. Ay, saith he, they that do not hear shall be so counted indeed; do you therefore hear.
>
> Bun. But, Sir, said I, he saith, he that shall leave off either preaching or hearing, &c. That is, if he hath received a gift for edification, it is his sin if he doth not lay it out in a way of exhortation and counsel, according to the proportion of his gift, as well as to spend his time altogether in hearing others preach.
>
> Cobb. But, said he, how shall we know that you have received a gift?
>
> Bun. Said I, Let any man hear and search, and prove the doctrine by the Bible.
>
> Cobb. But will you be willing, said he, that two indifferent persons shall determine the case, and will you stand by their judgment.

> Bun. I said, Are they infallible?
> Cobb. He said, No.
> Bun. Then, said I, it is possible my judgment may be as good as theirs: but yet I will pass by either, and in this matter be judged by the Scriptures; I am sure that is infallible, and cannot err.
> Cobb. But, said he, who shall be judge between you, for you take the Scriptures one way, and they another.
> Bun. I said, The Scripture should, and that by comparing one scripture with another; for that will open itself, if it be rightly compared. . . .
> Cobb. But are you willing, said he, to stand to the judgment of the church?
> Bun. Yes, sir, said I, to the approbation of the church of God; the church's judgment is best expressed in Scripture.[1]

When Cobb reminded him that the Scriptures say "The powers that are, are ordained of God," Bunyan replied that he did submit to the king and his governors.

> Cobb. Well then, said he, the king then commands you, that you should not have any private meetings, because it is against his law, and he is ordained of God; therefore you should not have any.
> Bun. I told him that Paul did own the powers that were in his day, as to be of God; and yet he was often in prison under them for all that. And also, though Jesus Christ told Pilate that he had no power against him, but of God, yet he died under the same Pilate; and yet, said I, I hope you will not say that either Paul, or Christ, were such as did deny magistracy, and so sinned against God in slighting the ordinance. Sir, said I, the law hath provided two ways of obeying: the one to do that which I in my conscience do believe that I am bound to do actively, and where I cannot obey actively, there I am willing to lie down, and to suffer what they shall do unto me.[2]

Elected when the people were "intoxicated" by the king's return,[3] the new Parliament proceeded to settle the Church in a way which favored neither comprehension nor toleration; frustrated in their desire to get a general revenge on the Roundheads and to regain their lost lands, the Cavaliers retaliated with a series of laws, commonly miscalled "the Clarendon Code."[4] The first of these statutes was designed to limit all

1. Bunyan, Works, vol. IV, pp. 486-487.
2. Ibid.
3. Vide Dale, op. cit., p. 408.
4. Vide Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., pp. 449-450.

municipal offices to Anglicans who would renounce the Covenant, take an oath of non-resistance and receive Communion in the Church of England; thus all Presbyterians, Republicans, Roman Catholics and Sectarians were excluded from all places of authority in the towns and cities. The second of these statutes, known as the Act of Uniformity (May 19, 1662), extended the same requirements to those in church offices; all clergymen were to declare their "unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by" the slightly revised Prayer Book and under threat of deprivation were required to subscribe to the following declaration:

> I A. B. do declare, That it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever, to take Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that Traiterous Position of taking Arms by his Authority against his Person, or against those that are Commissionated by him; and that I will Conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England as it is now by Law established: And I do declare that I do hold there lyes no Obligation upon me, or any other Person, from the Oath commonly called, The Solemn League and Covenant, to endeavour any Change or Alteration of Government, either in Church or State; and that the same was in it self an unlawful Oath, and imposed upon the Subjects of this Realm, against the known Laws and Liberties of this Kingdom.[1]

Those who preached after the Feast of St. Bartholomew (August 24th) without having subscribed to this declaration and without having obtained 'license' from their respective bishop would be subjected to a three months' imprisonment for each offence. Baxter stopped preaching three months earlier so that all might know he had no intentions of conforming; on August 24th, "about one thousand eight hundred, or Two thousand Ministers were Silenced and Cast out."[2] Tanner says that the king tried to suspend this Act but was "frustrated by the united and determined opposition of the bishops and the constitutional lawyers."[3] Yet the people still looked to Parliament for relief; they plied its members with

1. Ut per Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. II, p. 393.
2. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. II, pp. 384-385.
3. Tanner, op. cit., p. 229.

petitions and letters, but they received no encouragement from that body. In presenting the Conventicle Act (May 17, 1664) to his Majesty, Sir Edward Turner explained that while the "Fanatics, Sectaries and Nonconformists" differ in shapes and species they all were enemies to the established government in Church and State.

> '. . . if the old rule hold true, Qui Ecclesiae contradicit non est pacificus, we have great reason to prevent their growth and to punish their practice. To this purpose, we have prepared a Bill against their frequenting of Conventicles, the seed-plots and nurseries of their opinions, under pretence of religious worship. The first offence [of being in a Conventicle, or meeting of more than five persons in addition to members of a family, for any religious purpose not in conformity with the Church of England] we have made punishable only with a small fine of £5 or three months' imprisonment, and £10 for a peer. The second offence with £10 or six months' imprisonment, and £20 for a peer. But for the third offence, after a trial by a jury at the general quarter-sessions or assizes, and the trial of a peer by his peers, the party convicted shall be transported [for seven years] to some of your Majesty's foreign plantations, unless he redeem himself by laying down £100.[1]

Baxter says that most of the pastors and the people "were filled with Disdain and Indignation against the Prelates;" men were beginning to say, It will be but a little while 'til God will pull down "so wicked and cruel a Generation of Men."[2] As early as 1662 there were reports of strange things, such as the drying up of the River Derwent, the earth's swallowing a woman near Ashburn and the appearance of a mysterious army near Montgomery; but these things were discredited as the words of "the Fanaticks." The Plague began around the first of 1665; on June 7th, Pepys records going in Drury Lane and seeing "two or three houses marked with a red cross upon the doors, and 'Lord have mercy upon us' writ there.'"[3] By the end of June the king and his court had left the city for Salisbury, and all who could leave were hurrying away. In July, the

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. II, p. 385.
2. Vide Ibid., pp. 432-433.
3. Ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 256-257.

mortality rose to 4129 ("the bell always going"); in August it jumped to 20,046 ("the town is like a place distressed and forsaken"); in September it reached 26,230 (only the pest-carts moved through the grass-grown streets).[1] London was practically deserted of all physicians and clergymen;[2] Baxter writes,

> when the Plague grew hot, most of the Conformable Ministers fled, and left their Flocks, in the time of their Extremity: whereupon divers Non-conformists pitying the dying and distressed People, that had none to call the impenitent to Repentance, nor to help Men to prepare for another World, nor to comfort them in their Terrors, . . . resolved that no obedience to the Laws of any mortal Men whosoever, could justifie them for neglecting of Men's Souls and Bodies in such extremities. . . . Therefore they resolved to stay with the People, and to go in to the forsaken Pulpits, though prohibited, and to preach to the poor People before they dyed; and also to visit the Sick, and get what relief they could for the Poor, especially those that were shut up. Those that set upon this work, were Mr. Thomas Vincent, late Minister in Milk-street; with some Strangers that came thither, since they were Silenced, as Mr. Chester, Mr. Janeway, Mr. Turner, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Franklin, and some others.[3]

Baxter does not mention any "Fanatical" preachers who shared this hazardous task (he himself was safely away), but we can easily imagine that they were there. Unnamed and unnumbered, they were of the poor themselves, and the poor could not escape; as they lived on the darkest alleys, we can imagine they preached in the darkest places, and no account was made of their service. Under the term nonconformists they were apt to lose their identity, and as all who had not received episcopal ordination were now considered laymen in the sight of the church, it is more difficult to distinguish the purely lay-preachers. The Baptists and Quakers still had lay-preachers, and as they were strong in the city before the persecution, we can imagine they preached when the officers fled and the people were left unto themselves to die. At any rate the news of irregular preaching

1. Ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 256-258.
2. The brave Archbishop Sheldon remained in the City.
3. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. III, p. 2.

reached Parliament sitting at Oxford, and the Five Mile Act was passed (Oct. 31, 1665), which forbade all ministers who had refused to take the Oath to come "within five miles of any City, or Parliament Borough, or of the Church where they had served," under the threat of a forty pound penalty.[1] A similar penalty was threatened on all who should "'teach any public or private school, or take any boarders or tablers, that are taught or instructed by him or herself, or any other,'" who had not taken the oath and who did not frequent the established divine service.[2] This Act cut Puritanism from the towns and schools and inflicted a loss on its culture which "was never completely made good."[3] Burnet says that this bill was promoted by the secret favorers of Popery, "their constant maxim being, to bring all the Sectaries into so desperate a state, that they should be at mercy, and forced to desire a toleration on such terms, as the King should think fit to grant it on."[4] Even though their suffering had come from Parliament, yet the non-conformists continued to have faith in the House of Commons; the king offered help, but they were suspicious of his gestures for they feard that a toleration of the Romanists would be only the beginning of a severer persecution of all Protestants.[5] Baxter tells us that no sooner had the Plague died down and the people returned to the City, than a "third terrible Judgment"[6] came upon London; on the morning of September 2, 1666, a fire broke out and swept across two-thirds of the entire city—leaving ashes and ruins from the Tower to the Temple, from the river nearly to Smithfield. At Acton, Baxter picked up

1. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, pp. 224-225.
2. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 258-259.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 451.
4. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, p. 225.
5. Vide Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. II, p. 430; Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 242-243.
6. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. III, p. 17.

half burnt leaves of books; the sky was so filled with smoke that the sun shone "with a colour like Blood;" but "the dolefullest sight of all was afterwards, to see what a ruinous confused place the City was, by Chimneys and Steeples only standing in the midst of Cellars and heaps of Rubbish."[1] With eighty-nine churches burned and many of "the parish ministers gone (for want of places and maintenance)," Baxter says that "the Nonconformists were now more resolved than ever, to preach till they were imprisoned;" some of them kept their meetings "very openly" and prepared large rooms or built plain chapels to accommodate the crowds which attended their preaching.[2] Along with the more respectable Independents, there must have come a host of "the unsent ones," who after searching the Scriptures, meditation and prayer cried out the judgments of God. Such able conformists as Stillingfleet, Tillotson and White were also busy preaching in the city. All cried judgment—one because of the city's sins against the bishops and the king, while the other because of the bishops' and the king's sins; Baxter says thus "they did both fly from repentance more and more."[3] Another disaster occurred in June, 1667; within sight of the forts and the citizenry, the Dutch slipped up the Thames and burned the greater part of the English navy. This caused such "a great consternation" that the king came and appealed to the citizens not to desert him or to do or say anything contrary to their fidelity to him.[4] The popular indignation was directed against Charles and his mistresses; men began to wonder how a prince could have lost "'so much in so little time'" and to reflect upon Cromwell and "'what brave things he did.'"[5]

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. III, pp. 16-17.
2. Ibid., p. 19.
3. Ibid., pp. 17-18.
4. Ibid., p. 20.
5. Pepys, ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 267.

For a time after these events, the Nonconformists in London were permitted to hold their meetings in the open air or in temporary tabernacles amid the ruins; in the Records of the Broadmead Church at Bristol, we are told that "because ye Separates in London had liberty many partes of this Nation were Influenced therby, that we had alsoe liberty for about four years after in some good Measure."[1] However, Parliament became alarmed at the increasing number of "tabernacles" which were appearing in London and in 1670 passed a new conventicle act, which Marvell called the "quintessence of arbitrary malice."[2] For a meeting of more than four people in addition to the members of a family for worship other than by the Anglican service, each person (over sixteen years of age) was to be fined five shillings for the first offence and ten for each succeeding offence, while the preacher or teacher of such a conventicle was to be fined twenty pounds for the first offence and forty for each succeeding one; the house-holder which allowed such a meeting on his premises was liable to a fine of twenty pounds for each offence. One third of the fines was to be allotted to the informer of such conventicles, and the officers were subject to fines if they failed to act when informed of these meetings. Masson says that this act made the business of detecting and suppressing conventicles into a system; "hundreds of blackguards" made a "lucrative living by it," and the justices of peace were "perpetually occupied in receiving information and trying offenders;"[3] the jails were filled with men and women who could not or would not pay fines for what they thought was their natural right as Englishmen and their sacred

1. Edward Terrill, The Records of A Church of Christ Meeting in Broadmead (A. D. 1640 to A. D. 1688), ed., Nathaniel Haycroft (London: J. Heaton & Son, 1865), 58.
2. Ut per Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 573.
3. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 586-587.

obligation as Christians.

> Most of the Presbyterian ministers and many of the Independent and Baptist preachers tried to avoid conflict with the law by arrangements for preaching among their adherents from house to house with never more than four persons present in addition to the family; but even these might blunder or be trepanned. Such offenders were numerous among the Baptists; but no denomination so amazed and perplexed the Authorities by their obstinancy as the Quakers.[1]

Foreseeing the crisis, Fox had given the word: "'Now is the time for you to stand, you that have been public men, and formerly did travel abroad; mind and keep up your testimony, go into your meeting-houses as at other times.'"[2] Burnet says that in imitation of Daniel the Quakers met in worship more publicly because they were forbidden to do so; their doors were left open for all to come in, and when some were taken they all went to prison, refusing to pay "the wages of unrighteousness" as they called the fines and jailor's fees.[3] Boasting that their worship was not dependent upon any object, form or minister, these brave men and women proclaimed that it could not be stopped by men or devils, and they well nigh proved it. Men stormed into their silence, hooted, ridiculed and shouted at them; they threw trash and rubbish on them; the silent people sat calmly in a heavenly peace. They were dragged out in twos and threes; they re-entered through the windows and quietly resumed their places. The walls and rafters were knocked down; they sat among the ruins.[4] The men and women were taken to prison; their children came and took their places. The children were threatened and beaten, but they would not leave.[5] Even Baxter had to admire such courage and resoluteness; he tells us that "many turned Quakers, because the Quakers kept their Meetings

1. Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 587.
2. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., p. 474.
3. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, pp. 270-271.
4. Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 587-588.
5. Barclay, op. cit., pp. 475-476.

openly, and went to Prison for it cheerfully."[1] It was debated whether their silence was a religious service or not, and twice did a jury acquit them on the charge of violating the law;[2] Masson says, the authorities began to fear them as "a kind of supernatural folk, and knew not what to do with them but cram them into jails and let them lie there."[3] Barclay estimates that between 1661 and 1697, thirteen thousand five hundred and sixty-two Quakers suffered imprisonment, one hundred and ninety-eight were transported beyond the seas, and three hundred and thirty-eight died in prison or of their wounds.[4] Masson says:

> By their peculiar method of open violation of the law and passive resistance only, they rendered a service to the common cause of all the Nonconformist sects which has never been sufficiently acknowledged.[5]

These experiences profoundly affected the Quaker movement; the activities of the travelling ministers were greatly limited, and the local groups or congregations became more isolated and independent; Russell says that "the strain of persecution developed weaknesses in the membership and exaggerated tendencies to eccentricity in some members."[6] The courage of humble tradesmen in meeting persecution attracted men and women of the higher classes, some of whom found among the despised "Fanaticks" the quiet faith and religious assurance for which they had long sought. Russell says that Isaac and Mary Penington, Thomas Ellwood, William Penn, Robert Barclay, George Keith and others like them "brought the Society a combination of fresh enthusiasm, learning and social position" which proved of inestimable value in the struggle for survival; they sided with

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. II, p. 436.
2. Ibid.
3. Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 587-588.
4. Barclay, op. cit., p. 476.
5. Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 588.
6. Russell, op. cit.,pp. 93-94.

Fox in recognizing the need of a closer organization and some kind of church authority.[1] As we have noted already, the Quaker leaders had been forced to recall certain unstable preachers and to establish a system of assignments for their itinerant publishers; in 1660 Oliver Atherton makes a detailed report of the meetings which he and John Shield had conducted in Staffordshire where Fox had sent them.[2] In 1666 Farnsworth wrote a letter outlining the need of further organization, and in 1668 Fox prepared a draft of such plans which purposed to revive the travelling ministry, to sustain the existing membership and to win others to their faith.[3] Barclay quotes the following minutes of a Ministers Meeting, dated 17th Third Month, 1675:

> 'It is desired that all Friends in and about the city that have a public testimony for God do meet with the brethren on every First-day and Second-day mornings when they can.' Otherwise they are 'to send a note to the meetings signifying what meetings they intend to be at on First-days.'[4]

Barclay suggests that these Monday morning meetings were to make future arrangements and that the meetings on Sunday morning at eight o'clock were to complete their plans; "they then dispresed, the horses standing in readiness in the yard for those who visited the more distant meetings."[5] Russell says that "the Morning Meeting" grew out of this custom of the Quaker preachers' meeting to plan their meetings so that they would not all go to one place and leave another place empty; later these meetings assumed disciplinary authority in dealing with ministers charged with moral lapses, and acted for the whole Society in cases of emergency.[6] It

1. Russell, op. cit., pp. 93-94.
2. Barclay, op. cit., p. 342.
3. Russell, op. cit., p. 140.
4. Ut per Barclay, op. cit., pp. 380-381.
5. Ibid., pp. 381-382.
6. Russell, op. cit., pp. 136-137.

seems that "the Apostles" or travelling ministers had authority to "ordain Elders in every City" and that "every Travelling Minister holding a certificate was by his office a member of the Yearly Meeting."[1] In his Apology for the True Christian Divinity (1675), Robert Barclay says that the true minister of the gospel is "ordained, prepared, and supplied in the work of the ministry" by the Spirit of God and that by its "leading, moving, and drawing" every evangelist and pastor ought

> to be led and ordered in his labour and work of the gospel, both as to the place where, as to the persons to whom, and as to the times when he is to minister. Moreover, those who have this authority may and ought to preach the gospel, though without human commission or literature.[2]

While he recognizes that "some are more particularly called to the work of the ministry," Barclay opposes the distinction between clergy and laity because it tends to make a trade or "heathenish art" out of preaching and to abuse those "good honest, mechanic men" who speak as the Spirit is given them.

> It is left to the free gift of God to choose any whom he seeth meet thereunto, whether rich or poor, servant or master, young or old, yea, male or female. And such as have this call, verify the gospel, by preaching not in speech only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much fulness, I Thess. i.5; and cannot but be received and heard by the sheep of Christ.[3]

The work of the ministry is "more constantly and particularly to instruct, exhort, admonish, oversee, and watch over their brethren" than is the duty of every common believer,[4] but every one who preaches is really an evangelist. The first evangelists or preachers of our faith were plain, mechanic and illiterate men, and many such men "did, without learning,

1. Barclay, op. cit., p. 394.
2. Robert Barclay, An Apology for the True Christian Divinity; Being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People Called Quakers, (10th ed., London: Harvey and Darton, 1841), 281.
3. Ibid., p. 303.
4. Ibid., p. 307.

seems that "the Apostles" or travelling ministers had authority to "ordain Elders in every City" and that "every Travelling Minister holding a certificate was by his office a member of the Yearly Meeting."[1] In his Apology for the True Christian Divinity (1675), Robert Barclay says that the true minister of the gospel is "ordained, prepared, and supplied in the work of the ministry" by the Spirit of God and that by its "leading, moving, and drawing" every evangelist and pastor ought

> to be led and ordered in his labour and work of the gospel, both as to the place where, as to the persons to whom, and as to the times when he is to minister. Moreover, those who have this authority may and ought to preach the gospel, though without human commission or literature.[2]

While he recognizes that "some are more particularly called to the work of the ministry," Barclay opposes the distinction between clergy and laity because it tends to make a trade or "heathenish art" out of preaching and to abuse those "good honest, mechanic men" who speak as the Spirit is given them.

> It is left to the free gift of God to choose any whom he seeth meet thereunto, whether rich or poor, servant or master, young or old, yea, male or female. And such as have this call, verify the gospel, by preaching not in speech only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much fulness, I Thess. i.5; and cannot but be received and heard by the sheep of Christ.[3]

The work of the ministry is "more constantly and particularly to instruct, exhort, admonish, oversee, and watch over their brethren" than is the duty of every common believer,[4] but every one who preaches is really an evangelist. The first evangelists or preachers of our faith were plain, mechanic and illiterate men, and many such men "did, without learning,

1. Barclay, op. cit., p. 394.
2. Robert Barclay, An Apology for the True Christian Divinity; Being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People Called Quakers, (10th ed., London: Harvey and Darton, 1841), 281.
3. Ibid., p. 303.
4. Ibid., p. 307.

by the Spirit of God, greatly contribute in divers places to the Reformation."[1] That God had called many laboring and mechanic men to serve as evangelists in his day, Barclay says:

> I myself am a true witness; and can declare from certain experience, because my heart hath been often greatly broken and tendered by that virtuous life that proceeded from the powerful ministry of those illiterate men.[2]

The Baptists met the persecutions in much the same spirit as did the Quakers, but with different methods and without undergoing any great change in organization. Not many Baptists had entered Cromwell's national church; it is estimated that only twenty-six Baptist ministers were ejected in 1662.[3] While both groups of Baptists denounced the Venner rebellion and professed loyalty to the king, there were a few Baptists involved in the plots of 1660 and 1663 which gave an excuse for a severer persecution.[4] In 1661 John James, a preacher of a Seventh-Day Baptist conventicle in London, was hanged, drawn and quartered on the accusation of having used treasonable language in his sermons;[5] in 1663 twelve General Baptists were condemned to death for attending a religious meeting and would have been executed, had not the king interceded.[6] These were extreme cases, but the Baptists suffered many imprisonments and fines; their system of itinerant ministry was completely disorganized and almost destroyed.[7] For an example, Vavasour Powell, who had received a commission from Parliament in 1649 "for the better propagating and preaching of the Gospel in Wales," was seized in 1660 and sent to London; after several years in prison he was released but he was retaken upon resuming his preaching and

1. Barclay, An Apology, pp. 309-310.
2. Ibid., p. 300.
3. Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 96.
4. Ibid., p. 93.
5. Vide Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 228.
6. Vide Crosby, op. cit., vol. II, p. 181.
7. Vide Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 595.

died in the Fleet in 1670.[1] There were many ill rumors and false reports about the Baptists;[2] they shared with the Quakers in being the main target of ridicule and abuse, of which the following may be cited as a mild example:

> 'The Cobblers and the Tinkers
> Must now forbear to Preach,
> Taylors, Joyners and Tanners,
> Must no false doctrine teach;
> . . . . . .
> You Quakers and you Dippers,
> Your wicked deeds all rue;
> With speed return and go to church,
> And leave that factious crew.'[3]

However, the Baptist cobblers and tinkers did not forbear their preaching; all groups of Baptists believed that the whole church should be zealous in evangelizing and teaching others. Most of their ministers were tradesmen who earned their own living by manual labor; Whitley says,

> of one hundred and forty General Baptist Elders who flourished in this period, we can trace the callings of forty: one was a gentleman of good estate, twelve were yeomen, three husbandmen, two labourers, three maltsters, one a thatcher, two blacksmiths; two wool combers, one a weaver, one a fuller, one a tailor, one a shoemaker, one a bricklayer, one a carpenter, one a shipwright, one an ironmonger; a shop-keeper, a printer, a grocer, a baker, a butcher, and a barber-surgeon complete the list. . . . Nor is there reason to think that a close scrutiny into the Particular Baptists would show any great contrast. The doctrine of the priesthood of all believers was held most thoroughly, the churches called to the ministry any of their own number who seemed gifted.[4]

Thus when their ministers were arrested, others stepped into their places so that the services continued throughout the persecutions. In the Broadmead Church in Bristol when Mr. Ewins was "taken up," Brother Thomas Ellis was "sett aparte for y^{e} worke of a Ruleing Elder;"[5] when Ellis was

1. C. Silvester Horne, A Popular History of the Free Churches (3rd. ed., London: James Clarke & Co., 1903), 182-183.
2. Vide Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. III, p. 106.
3. Ut per Whitley, British Baptists, pp. 108-109.
4. Whitley, British Baptists, p. 153.
5. Terrill, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

imprisoned the members "contented themselves with meane Gifts," but the church still met and the Word was preached.[1] At times these preachers had to slip out a back door, hide in the cellar or leave through a secret passage, but the threat of imprisonment, fines and banishment did not keep them from preaching.[2] After a period of peace following the London fire, the Nonconformists again were persecuted. In 1670 their public meeting-places in Bristol were closed, nailed and locked; Terrill says that they met "in y^{e} Lanes and highways for severall months." After having some "rest" during the mayoralty of John Knight who "did winke at our meeting and was not ready to Receive every Information," the "eighth persecution" of the Bristol churches began in October 1674 with the arrival of a new bishop, Guy Carleton, who declared that he would not leave "y^{e} Track of a Meeting in Bristoll."[3] Terrill tells us that at that time there were <u>six</u> Separate Churches settled in Bristol:

> Three Baptized Congregations, Two Independent Congregations, and one Presbyterian Congregation: viz., Mr. Hardcastle's, being our meeting, most parte Baptized; Mr. Gifford's, all Baptized; and Mr. Kitching's all Baptized. And Mr. Thompson's, and Mr. Troughton's Congregations, were Independents; and Mr. Weekes' Congregation was Presbyterians.[4]

When all their ministers were arrested (February 6, 1674), representatives of these congregations met together to consult how to carry on their meetings; Terrill reports,

> Some even were ready of thinking to give off, viz., of y^{e} Presbyterians; that they could not carry it on, Because of their Principle was not to hear a man not bred up at y^{e} university, and not Ordained. But y^{e} Lord appeared, and helped us to prevaile with them to hold on, and keep up their meetings. And for y^{e} first, and some time, we concluded this; to Come and Assemble together, and for one to Pray and read a Chapter, and then sing a Psalme, and after

1. Terrill, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 53-54.
2. <u>Vide Ibid.</u>, pp. 57-58.
3. <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 67-68.
4. <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 92.

> conclude with Prayer; and soe two Brethren to carry on y^e^ Meeting one day, and two another, for a while,—to try what they would doe with us. Soe we did, and Ordered one of y^e^ doors of our meeting place to be made fast, and all to come in at one, but open it when we goe forth; And to appoint some youth, or two of them, to be out at y^e^ door every meting, to Watch when Hellier and other informers or officers were coming, and soe to come in, one of them, and give us notice thereof. Alsoe, some of y^e^ hearers, women and Sisters, would Sitt and Crowde in y^e^ Staires, when we did begin y^e^ Meeting with an Exercise, that soe y^e^ Informers might not too Suddainely come in upon us; by reason of which they were prevented divers times.[1]

Terrill says that at their meetings, "we presently made use of our ministering gifts in y^e^ Church, (as we did in former persecutions, Contenting ourselves with meane gifts and coarse fare in y^e^ want of Better)."[2] In order to perserve their speakers and yet to leave their meetings open for strangers to attend, they hung a curtain around the place where the preacher stood and filled that area with trusted men; when the youths in the street gave the alarm of an approaching informer, the women would crowd around the door and the men would cause the speaker to sit down and pull back the curtain as all the people started singing.[3]

> Which meanes y^e^ Lord blessed, that many times when y^e^ Mayor came they were all Singing, that he knew not who to take away more than another. And soe when y^e^ Mayor, Hellier, or y^e^ other informers, had taken our names, and done what they would, and carryed away whom they pleased, and when they were gone downe out of our Roomes, Then we ceased Singing, and drew y^e^ Curtaine againe, and y^e^ Minister, or Brother, would goe on with y^e^ rest of his Sermon, untill they came againe, (which sometimes they would thrice in our meeting disturb us,) or untill our time was Expired.[4]

The other Separate Churches in Bristol took similar methods of resistance. At Weekes' Church, the "putt a wainscott Board in a Convenient place in Meeting, behinde which he that spake did stand out of sight of y^e^ greatest parte of y^e^ People, and yet all might hear;" when they were warned of the informer's coming, they conveyed the speaker into another house. At

1. Terrill, op. cit., pp. 98-99.
2. Ibid., p. 100.
3. Ibid., pp. 101-102.
4. Ibid.

Gifford's church, they made a trap-door at the speaker's feet through which they let the speaker down into a lower room. At Thompson's church, they used a stairs behind the curtain, up which the speaker could go into a upper room and out into a neighboring house.[1] For a time they were thus able to defeat the purpose of Hellier, but at last on one occasion someone pulled the curtain too soon and Robert Colston, an unsuspected spy, saw Edward Terrill lay down his book and sit down; he declared this information before the Justices, which caused Terrill to spend more than five hundred pounds "to defend ourselves as Englishmen, but most in vain."[2] In August 1675, the whole city of Bristol was threatened with fines for permitting conventicles contrary to the law, and the Broadmead Church devised yet another method, that of reading letters from their imprisoned pastor. By October 1675 the meetings had "grown very poore and leane through fines, imprisonments, and constant Whorrying of us every day;" however, at the end of the year, a time of peace came and the church flourished again.[3]

During these persecutions the king continued to profess his desire for toleration and to receive numerous petitions from the Nonconformists with avowed sympathy; however, men had become suspicious of his motives. The popularity and growth of Romanism at his court was not a secret; the queen mother, Charles' Portuguese queen, and some of his chief ministers were passionately Roman Catholic, with a large following of Crypto-Catholics who would make an open profession if a favorable occasion occurred.[4] There were such rumors about the king that it became necessary to pass a law penalizing those who said he was a Papist. Burnet tells of

1. Terrill, op. cit., pp. 102-103.
2. Ibid., p. 124.
3. Ibid., p. 144.
4. Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 239.

a secret meeting of Romanists in the home of the Earl of Bristol where they were advised "to take pains to procure favour to the Nonconformists" and "to bestir themselves to procure a toleration for them in general terms," that they might bring in their own religion.[1] When in March 1672 the king suspended all penal laws against the Nonconformists and promised licenses to all nonconformist preachers and places of worship, the relief and joy were conditioned by the fear of reviving papacy. Burnet says that the court tried to persuade the Nonconformists to make addresses and compliments upon this toleration, "but few were so blind, as not to see what was aimed at by it."[2] The bishops became alarmed and began preaching against popery; when the king complained that such controversial preaching would alienate the people from his government, Tillotson replied that it should be strange if the king would forbid them from defending the religion which he professed.[3] Burnet says that some of the Presbyterian ministers thanked the king for this indulgence and some of them accepted pensions from him,[4] but others were alarmed at the renewed Romanism and professed that "'they had rather still go without their desired liberty than have it in a way that would prove so detrimental to the nation.'"[5] Some of the Congregationalists presented an address to the king in which they promised to pray that God would "'continue his royal heart in these councils and thoughts of indulgence,'" but most of them were suspicious of his intentions and used this freedom to preach on the chief issues between Protestants and Catholics. Some of their leaders accepted gifts from the royal purse; Owen received a thousand guineas which he distributed among the

1. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, pp. 193-194.
2. Ibid., pp. 307-308
3. Ibid., pp. 308-309.
4. Ibid., p. 308.
5. Alderman Love, ut per Dale, op. cit., p. 439.

poor ministers, but he denied that these pensions were offered or accepted as bribes.[1] Out of four hundred and twenty Baptist preachers only two hundred and ten even bothered to apply for licenses, which they regarded as unconstitutional without consent of Parliament and as a compromise of their inalienable right of free worship.[2] However, they, with hundreds of other nonconformists, welcomed the release of their ministers from prison and the undisturbed peace of their meetings. After twelve years in the Bedford jail, John Bunyan was freed (1672) and the Bedford Church "'did with joynt consent (signifyed by solemne lifting up of their hands) call forth and appoint our brother John Bunyan to the pastorall office or eldership.'"[3] Although he owned "water baptism to be God's ordinance," he followed the example of his predecessor in favoring open membership, and in applying for license under the Act of Indulgence of 1672 he styled himself a Congregationalist.[4] As pastor of the Bedford Church, he was something of a "bishop" to lay-preachers, for with his own application (May 1672) he requested licenses for twenty-five other preachers and for thirty other buildings.[5] Hundreds of such applications poured in from all the counties of England; many were written on mere scraps of paper, of which the following may be cited as typical:

> 'CHRISTOPHER FOWLER prays to have his Majesty's gracious licence for his house in the village of Kennington, in the parish of Lambeth, in the county of Surrey; and a licence for to allow him to preach in any licensed place. — May 25, 1672'
>
> I, Katherine Floyde, widow, dwelling in the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, do desire that a room or rooms in my proper dwelling-house in the Strand may be allowed for a meeting-house.—In witness whereof I have subscribed my name, KATHERINE FLOYDE, widow.'[6]

1. Vide Dale, op. cit., pp. 437-438.
2. Vide Underwood, op. cit., pp. 102-103.
3. Ut per Brown, Bunyan, p. 213.
4. Vide Underwood, op. cit., pp. 103-104
5. Vide Brown, Bunyan, pp. 216-217.
6. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., pp. 609-610.

Waddington says that within ten months about three thousand five hundred licenses were granted.[1] A typical license read:

> 'CHARLES REX.
> 'CHARLES, by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc., to all mayors, bailiffs, constables, and other our officers and ministers, civil and military, whom it may concern, greeting. In pursuance of our declaration of the 15th of March, 1671, we do hereby permit and license A B of the Congregational persuasion, to be a teacher of the congregation allowed by us, in a room or rooms of his house in . . . for the use of such as do not conform to the Church of England, who are of that persuasion commonly called Congregational, with farther license and permission to him the said A B to teach in any place licensed and allowed by us, according to our said declaration.
> 'Given at our court at Whitehall the second day of May, in the twenty-fourth year of our reign, 1671. By his majesty's command.'
> 'ARLINGTON.'[2]

When the Cavalier Parliament reassembled in March 1673 very few of its members knew that by the secret treaty of Dover (1670) their king had promised the French monarch to declare his conversion to Catholicism at an appropriate time with the view of re-establishing it in England and to assist France in destroying the Protestant state of Holland in return for money and soldiers; however, many suspected some secret plans, and even the two hundred pensioners in Commons trembled at the prospects of the future. Trevelyan says:

> . . . the visible indications of danger loomed all the more big and black, because what lurked behind them was unseen. The unnatural alliance with France to destroy the Protestant State of Holland, the presence of a standing army under officers whose religion was suspect, the ill-concealed Romanism of the Duke of York, who commanded our fleets, and of Clifford, who controlled our counsels, the abeyance of the Penal Laws throughout the country and the 'flaunting of Papists' at Court, all combined to create a panic which for a few weeks overcame the desire of pensioners to earn their reward, of Dissenters to enjoy the Declaration of Indulgence, and of Anglicans to persecute Dissent.[3]

The Declaration of Indulgence was denounced in Commons as unconstitutional

1. Waddington, op. cit., p. 610.
2. Ut per Dale, op. cit., p. 442.
3. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 313.

and funds were denied the king until he broke the seal of Declaration with his own hands, making the preaching licenses worthless and exposing their holders to renewed persecution. Commons then proceeded to pass (1673) the Test Act which barred from public office all who refused to take the sacraments according to the rites of the Church of England; Clifford was driven from office, and the Duke of York resigned the admiralty of the fleet. The Catholicism and French sympathies of James, the legal heir to the throne, caused great alarm, and plans were being formulated to exclude him from the throne, when at the instigation of Titus Oates (1678) the house of the Duke's secretary was searched and a box of treasonable correspondence was found. In one of his letters to the confessor of the French monarch, Coleman, the Duke's secretary, asked for more money so that Charles could govern without Parliament:

> 'We have a mighty work upon our hands, no less than the conversion of three kingdoms, and by that the subduing of a pestilent heresy, which has domineered over a great part of this northern world a long time; there was never such hopes of success since the death of Queen Mary as now in our days.'[1]

Upon the murder of a magistrate and Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, "the creed of the plot became a raging panic;" men carried their guns with them into the streets, and people kept private watches against fire.[2] Although many questioned the wild accusations of Oates, yet Commons was convinced that there was "'a damnable and hellish Plot'" for the assassination of the king and the destruction of the Protestant religion; in November 1678 Commons requested the king to remove the Duke from all councils of State and Damby, the king's chief minister was threatened with impeachment. In the election of February 1679, the Whigs, led by Shaftsbury, swept the

1. Ut per Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 321.
2. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 320.

country and reintroduced the Exclusion Bill in the new Parliament, which Charles immediately prorogued.[1] A second Exclusion Bill was rejected by the House of Lords in 1680, and a third Whig Parliament was prorogued on March 28, 1681.

Without Parliament, the Whigs were handicapped; Tory sheriffs were appointed, and the Nonconformists were left to the mercy of informers and unprincipled judges. In Bristol the "Separate" ministers were pulled down from their pulpits and their meeting-houses were sacked; on December 30th about twenty of the Broadmead members had a service with their pastor in prison, while the other members met in Black Street and "Br. Jennings exercised among them."[2] Terrill tells us that by this time in Bristol

> y^e People belonging to y^e other Meetings had all left their Places, and met privately. Only y^e Quakers, whose meeting was nail'd up, met in y^e long Entry and Court by their Place. Y^e most of our Brethren were for meeting privately also; for y^e Persecutors went up and down to men's Shops to rifle and distrein their Goods, having convictions and warrants from y^e Mayor; and if they could not get in would bring Sledges and break open y^e Doors, and carrying away their Goods would sell them at what Rate they pleased. We therefore consented to meet privately also where we could, and to alter our Lecture to Wednesday Evening.[3]

On January 22, 1682, the Broadmead members met at Terrill's house about six or seven o'clock in the morning, but "while Mr. Enoch Prosser, a Gifted Br. belonging to Mr. Keech of London, who came to our Fair, was preaching," the officers came in, fined some and took others away.[4] After this they met in many places to escape detection, yet they often had to disperse on alarm or were surprised before they could escape. They met in fields, meadows and in the woods; they met at night, in the early

1. Masson says that English Whiggism was little else than English Puritanism and Republicism strained and percolated painfully and secretly through the intervening medium of so many years of the restored Stuart misgovernment. (Masson, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 620).
2. Terrill, op. cit., pp. 218-219, 227.
3. Ibid., pp. 228-229.
4. Ibid., pp. 230-231.

morning or different days of the week; they met in the rain as well as in fair weather, and even in snow and sleet they "kept a little meeting."[1]

> On y^e 20th, A Day of Prayer from nine to 5 in y^e Evening, at Mr. Jockson's over y^e Down, in Peace. This day Dan Barnett declared y^e Work of God on his Soul to y^e Ruling Elders, y^e Pastour being at London against y^e Term. And there being about 30 Aged and weak persons of y^e Church that could not go into y^e fields, the Day, agreed that 7 Brethren, viz. Ellis, Terrill, Dickason, Clark, Cornish, Rob. Lewis, James Lewis, should every one take 4, and preach or exercise what gifts they had, on Lord's day, either 8 in y^e morning, or at 5 in y^e Evening, for 2 hours' Space, that they might be built up, &c.[2]

Many of the Anglican laity were offended by the severe persecution of their nonconforming neighbors and as early as 1681 published a protest in which they stated:

> 'We find now that the Presbyterians . . . are fain to be content with the contributions of their church members, and so they and the Independents are become one fraternity.
>
> 'We find the Anabaptists to be the same also in their divine service as the Presbyterians and Independents are; but only in this difference; the one baptize infants, and the other baptize none but such people as are at years of discretion, and profess Christianity.
>
> 'We find that divers and several of those people called Quakers are also very good Christians, and preach true doctrine according to Holy Scripture: and therefore we declare that it is our opinion that such a voluntary ministry to preach on free cost, as aforesaid, is of excellent use, and exceeding necessary to be allowed of in the Church of England; not only for preaching to poor people, in poor tabernacles, who cannot pay anything sufficiently to maintain a ministry, nor get pews in their parish churches; but also it makes the learned clergy to be the more sober and studious in their places: and therefore we can think no other but that such a free voluntary ministry are sent of God, for we remember the Apostles were working men of several trades, as these are; yet we do not believe that God sent these to hinder the clergy of maintenance, but only to season them, as salt seasons meat.
>
> 'In great parishes there is need to be at least two congregations, the parish church for the orthodox minister and the rich, and a tabernacle for the lay prophets and poor.[3]

On March 26, 1682, Samuel Bolde, a vicar in Dorsetshire, preached against the persecution of righteous men and condemned the persecutors as unchristian and uncivil.

> 'All the Dissenters in the nation cannot prejudice the Church

1. Terrill, op. cit., pp. 237, 259.
2. Ibid., p. 237.
3. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., pp. 615-616.

> half so much as you, drunken, swearing, profane informers and persecutors. . . . Force and violence will never satisfy men's judgments. . . . The members of the Church must be volunteers, not pressed men.'[1]

These sentiments, however, did not check the persecutions; on April 11, 1683, the Broadmead congregation was caught in the woods and charged upon by mounted officers,[2] and on August 11, 1683, Sir W. Jenkins wrote:

> 'We burnt ten cart loads of pulpit doors, gates and seats, in the market place (of Taunton), we staid till three in the morning before all were burnt. We were very merry. The bells rang all night. The church is now full, and thank God for it! The fanatics dare not open their mouths.'[3]

In order to continue their worship and exhortation during these persecutions, the Broadmead members agreed

> to have circular meetings at 5 places where y^e^ brethren were to exercise their gifts, and twice in a Day, at 9 in y^e^ morning and at one in y^e^ afternoon. . . . And also 3 places for Prayer and repetition. . . . And because some might be sick or otherwise detained, we appointed 6 or 7 to a place, and y^e^ first 4 were to be taken in, and those that were shut out were to go to y^e^ Places of repetition. And none were to go to a place but once a day, and not to y^e^ same place every Ld's day, but round; so they came to y^e^ same place once in 5 weeks. And by this means near 100 might hear every Ld's day, and in a few Weeks had y^e^ Benefit of all y^e^ Church's Gifts. And besides, Br. Whinnell would repeat at some house in y^e^ Evening, and on Week Days at other places. Thus we kept within y^e^ Law which allowed 4 besides y^e^ Family. And on y^e^ 9th March we began this Circular meeting.[4]

Other Nonconformists made more radical plans and participated in the plots for recognizing Monmouth as the legal heir to the throne. However, their plans were frustrated, and the Duke of York, restored to his offices in defiance of the Test Act, was able to keep the king "true to his foreign Allegiance."[5] In February 1685, Charles became critically ill; after hearing an Anglican bishop exhort him to repent of his wicked life, he

1. Ut per Waddington, op. cit., pp. 613-614.
2. Vide Terrill, op. cit., pp. 248-249.
3. Ut per Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 478.
4. Terrill, op. cit., pp. 263-264.
5. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 353.

received a Roman Catholic priest who administered the last rites according to the Church of Rome.[1]

Burnet says that there were few tears shed for the former king and fewer shouts of joy for the new one.[2] James II promised to maintain the liberty and property of his subjects, the government as established by law and "'to defend and support the Church of England.'"[3] Many of the clergy were pleased to believe the words of a king, but on the second Sunday after his accession he went to Roman Mass in state and a few days later warned Archbishop Sancroft if the bishops failed in their duty toward him he would find other means of attaining his ends.[4] In May 1685, he summoned a "packed Parliament," but before he could get the Test Act repealed, Monmouth landed in the West and was proclaimed the Protestant king. This uprising was easily put down, and James permitted the savage Jeffreys to butcher three hundred men with maniac glee and to hang their corpses and hewn quarters along the highways and in the towns. Men died singing hymns and professing their love for "'English liberties and the Protestant religion;'" women were beheaded and burned for giving food and shelter to fugitives.[5] The army was increased and staffed with Romanist officers; when Parliament protested, James prorogued it (Nov. 19, 1685). The news of the destruction of the Huguenots in France by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) stirred England with fears and "prepared the mental and emotional background" for revolution.[6] Not heeding the cautious opinions of moderate Catholics, James continued his reckless policy of preparing "the way for the forcible reconversion of England;"[7]

1. Vide Hutton, op. cit., p. 214.
2. Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, p. 620.
3. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., p. 217.
4. Vide Hutton, op. cit., p. 218.
5. Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 109; Burnet, Own Times, vol. I, p. 649.
6. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 469.
7. Ibid.

prominent Tory ministers were replaced by Jesuits like Father Petre and by "scoundrels like Jeffreys and Sunderland,"[1] and Romanists were appointed to benefices of the Church of England. Steps were taken to revive the Court of High Commission; the Bishop of London was suspended for refusing to silence Protestant controversialists, and Richard Baxter was arrested and brutally tried by the savage Jeffreys.[2] James attempted to win the support of the Nonconformists by offering them (April 4, 1687) a Declaration of Liberty of Conscience, which opened the prisons "to thousands of the best men in England, and everywhere public worship was freely resumed by congregations who have never since been forced to close their doors."[3] While the Nonconformists were grateful for the relief from persecution, they were uneasy at the threat of Roman domination; when the bishops refused to read publicly a second declaration (1688), most of the Nonconformists sided with them. When seven of the bishops were sent to the Tower (June 8th), crowds of people lined the banks of the Thames and knelt as they passed by. On June 10th news was proclaimed that the queen had borne a son, thereby establishing the prospect of a Catholic succession and replacing the claim of James' Protestant daughter Mary and her husband, William of Orange, the "armed champion of the Protestants of Europe;" instead of the traditional rejoicing, there were rumors in the streets that the child was not the queen's but one which had been slipped into her chamber in a warming pan. On June 29th the seven bishops were brought to trial on the charge of conspiring to diminish the royal power; the next day the jury acquitted them amid shouts of joy. That night Whigs and Tories, Churchmen and Nonconformists signed an invitation to William of

1. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 360.
2. Vide Reliquiae Baxterianae, Pt. III, pp. 48-50 & 191-200.
3. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 363.

Orange to come over in the defense of English liberties. Warned of a possible invasion, James tried to reconcile those whom he had offended, but when William of Orange landed at Torbay on November 5th, the country deserted him and went over to the invader; on December 10th the queen fled with the baby prince, and on the next day he followed.

On February 13, 1689 a hastily assembled Parliament proclaimed William and Mary joint sovereigns, and the era of constitutional toleration began. William kept the bishops to the promises they had made to Protestant dissent; on May 24, 1689, the Elizabethan and Caroline Acts of uniformity were repealed, and the penalties imposed on nonconforming preachers and conventicles were abrogated. The Toleration Act extended freedom to all who promised fidelity to William and Mary, disowned all allegiance to foreign powers, professed faith in the Trinity and acknowledged the Holy Scriptures to be given by divine inspiration. All places of worship were to be certified and the doors of all religious services were to be left unlocked; any disturber of public worship or preaching was liable to a fine of twenty pounds. As generous as this Act was, it did not offer complete religious freedom; the Test and Cooperation Acts were not repealed and the ecclesiastical courts were left with authority to enforce payment of tithes and the fulfillment of other parochial duties; the Romanists were specifically excluded from all benefit or ease.[1] Nevertheless, the Romanists enjoyed a moderate toleration; Mass was said regularly in private houses, and the new government was accepted by the moderate Romanists with varying degrees of relief.[2] A large section of

1. Gee & Hardy, Documents, CXXIII, pp. 654-657.
2. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 374.

the Anglican clergy, holding to the doctrine of nonresistance and hereditary rights, refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary; four hundred of the Non-Jurors were deprived by Act of Parliament and formed "a private Church dear to the Anglican Jacobites."[1] Tillotson, Burnet and other Latitudinarian bishops were favored by King William and were elevated to places of authority; because they favored treating the Dissenters with "temper and moderation, they were represented as "secret favourers of Presbytery."[2] As "the best preacher of the Age" Archbishop Tillotson was able to persuade others to adopt the new style of plain preaching; Burnet says that Tillotson, Lloyd, South, Stillingfleet, Patrick and other preachers of the new style were "very much followed" and that they "brought off the City in a great measure from the prejudices that they had formerly to the Church."[3] While the Nonconformists at first delighted in the Toleration Act of 1689 and hailed it as the dawning of a new day, they soon experienced the effects of its limitations. Whitley says that religious liberty came "to a wearied generation, inclined to acquiesce in nearly any settlement that would give peace;"[4] the old animosities softened so that a Seventh Day Baptist could correspond with the Archbishop of Canterbury, agreeing that Christians should discover "'how close they can unite and become all of Christ'" and a tailor-preacher could become such a close friend with a vicar that at their request they shared the same grave.[5] Nevertheless, the restrictions of the settlement soon began to be felt among all the nonconforming groups. The Test and Cooperation Acts excluded all but Anglicans from the Universities and

1. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 375.
2. Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, p. 347.
3. Ibid., pp. 135 & 191
4. Whitley, British Baptists, p. 176.
5. Vide Underwood, op. cit., pp. 111, 113.

and all military and civil offices; Drysdale describes the restrictions of the Universities as "perhaps the deadliest and most subtle blow against a revival of Presbyterianism,"[1] and Whitley says that the

> strait boundaries of the Revolution Settlement explain how the Baptists with their friends had hence forth a history which rarely touches and scarcely ever influences the course of national history.[2]

The Presbyterians, whose presence among the Nonconformists had given them a social prestige which had aided in their struggle for survival, soon began to lose many of their young men who became Anglicans in order to enter the University and to qualify for better positions in life.[3] The Congregationalists, who became closely related to the Presbyterians, founded academies for the education of their young men, but many of them drifted into the Establishment.[4] In their Assembly of 1689, the Particular Baptists expressed concern for the better education of their ministers, Banysfield willed his library for their use and Terrill left the bulk of his property to support a teacher for them.[5] Some of the older leaders like Kiffin and Knollys came to bewail that "'much of the former life and vigour which attended us is gone'" and cited one of the causes as the neglect "'of giving fit and proper encouragement for the raising up of an able and honourable ministry for the time to come.'"[6] The position of the minister became more elevated among the Congregationalists than had been formerly so; Barclay says the Independent minister came to be more clerical or professional and "less that of 'primus inter pares' which he

1. Drysdale, op. cit., p. 493.
2. Whitley, British Baptists, p. 176.
3. Drysdale, op. cit., p. 531.
4. Dale, op. cit., pp. 507-509.
5. Vide Whitley, British Baptists, pp. 176-177; Underwood, op. cit., pp. 114-115, 130-131.
6. Ut per Barclay, Religious Societies, pp. 505-506.

possessed in earlier times."

> The teaching eldership, or staff of lay-preachers and evangelists who visited the villages and towns in the whole neighbourhood, was practically discouraged or suppressed, and some dangerous concessions were made as to the propriety of a 'governing eldership .'. . . The pastor lost the help, assistance and sympathy of a class of officers who were fellow labourers.[1]

Some of the Independent ministers came to scorn the assistance of lay-helpers. In 1691 Richard Davis, a London schoolmaster, became the pastor of an Independent Church at Rothwell; not only did he travel about the midland counties preaching with great success but he organized a band of twenty-eight lay-preachers to assist him. The "United Ministers" of London heard "with dismay that in Northamptonshire, with Mr. Davis's approval, a swarm of tailors, weavers, dyers, shoe-makers and farmers were preaching the Gospel" and asked Mr. Davis to appear before their "grave and learned" body to give an account of his activities.[2] Charged with having set up meetings in twenty-nine places and with sending forth "'many illiterate and ignorant preachers without advising with neighbouring Ministers,'" Davis asked "the United Ministers" why they did not "'thrust out some of that swarm they have at London (that eat the fat and drink the sweet), to offer the grace of Christ to the poor country people,'" instead of complaining of what he did for their salvation.[3] Dale says that many of the Independents had strong sympathies with Mr. Davis and thought that the London ministers had assumed too much authority,[4] but their censure seems to have discouraged any further effort to revive such a plan of evangelism. The Particular Baptists shared in this same development of a professional ministry; in their assembly of 1693, they strongly discouraged those "'who

1. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 594.
2. Dale, op. cit., p. 480.
3. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 593.
4. Dale, op. cit., p. 480.

being vainly puffed up with their fleshly mind, did presume to preach publicly without being called or appointed thereto;'" the churches were earnestly requested not to "'send forth nor suffer any persons among themselves to preach publicly, of whose qualifications they had not had sufficient trial,'" that "'the name of God may not be dishonoured, the peace of the churches disturbed, nor the reputation of the ministry blemished.'"[1] The General Baptists had developed a three-fold ministry of messengers, elders and deacons. The deacons were ordained to look after the church's charitable funds; the "ruling elder" was something of an ordained pastor who could baptize and administer the Lord's Supper, and the "teaching elders" were ordained men who participated in the preaching. The messengers or itinerant evangelists were also chosen by "the common suffrage of the church" and were ordained by fasting, prayer and the imposition of hands.[2] Thomas Grantham, in The Successors of the Apostles (1674), says the messengers are commissioned "'to preach the Gospel where it is not known, to plant churches where there is none, to ordain Elders in churches remote, and to assist in dispensing the holy Mysteries;'"[3] in Christianismus Primitivus (1678), he says that the office of messenger is of the same order as that of Epaphroditus, Barnabas, Luke, Mark, etc. and that it was not a distinct order of men but of gifts and functions.[4] However, Grantham had to caution the messengers against forcing themselves upon churches and to advise them to restrict their activities to newly planted ones; "'where the churches have an eldership, there they are in a capacity to ordain their own officers; yea, they may ordain and send forth Messengers.'" Grantham summarizes their position in these words:

1. Ut per Barclay, Religious Societies, pp. 505-506.
2. Underwood, op. cit., pp. 119-120.
3. Ut per Underwood, op. cit., p. 120.
4. Barclay, Religious Societies, pp. 353-354.

> 'As God hath given to His Church a fixed ministry of Bishops, Elders, Pastors, etc., to take care of particular churches, so He hath given her a travelling ministry, unfixed in respect of particular socieites, to whom it pertains . . . to take all occasions to cause the light of the glorious Gospel to shine upon such as sit in darkness, to plant churches, to confirm or settle them in the faith, to visit and comfort those who have believed through Grace.'[1]

The Toleration Act brought the Quakers a relief which was sorely needed but it also wrought profound changes; Russell says,

> The aggressive evangelization and missionary work that characterized the first decade of the Society's history had been slowed down to a considerable extent by the necessities of the struggle for existence after the Restoration. There was naturally an even greater pause for recuperation after 1689. The vigor of their attacks on current evils and their proselytizing zeal abated.[2]

The "Morning Meetings" of the ministers continued to develop in authority; in 1689 it was declared that no minister should "'go to any meeting near the City, without acquainting the Morning Meeting at the Chamber.'" Barclay says that in 1690 Fox directed all Friends who were accustomed to write to him to write to the Morning Meeting, which approved ministers and made arrangements so that "many should not go to one meeting, leaving others ill supplied."[3]

> Fox, in his reply to Harwood, one of the original band of preachers who had attacked his authority, says that 'it is known' that the Ministers 'do meet together,' and that 'every one takes his motion;' that he and the rest of the Ministers 'know what order is' in relation to the control and dispersion of the Ministers.
>
> Harwood states that, 'to my knowledge,' Fox thus 'orders' the preachers:--'Thou must go to such a place,' or 'such a place is ordered for thee;' and thither they must go, whether they have any command from God or no; and, 'in his absence, leaves one of his most eminent servants to order' the rest of those who are 'esteemed,' or deemed 'ministers,' or 'gives them a piece of paper' (probably a memorandum of the engagement to a particular congregation), which he says 'the soul of the rightous loathes!' Fox denies 'allowing any in his absence,' or 'sending papers to them.'[4]

1. Ut per Underwood, op. cit., pp. 120-121.
2. Russell, op. cit., p. 187.
3. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 381.
4. Ibid., pp. 382-383.

From the plan or arrangement books which remain we can see evidence of an 'orderly dispersion' of the Quaker preachers in London and environs; Barclay says that "the system was so complete that two Ministers were thus provided for every meeting."[1] In the journals of these travelling ministers we note the increasing wealth of the Quakers and the decline in spiritual life and strictness;[2] the new generation of preachers was more conservative than their predecessors; Russell says that "their purpose was to preserve and extend the principles and organization which had been created for them by the founders of the Society."[3] During the persecutions, quietism increased among the Quakers; Baxter, writing about 1664, speaks of the Quakers as "'poor deluded souls who would sometimes meet only to sit still in silence (when as they said, the Spirit did not speak).'"[4] However, the practice of 'silent meetings' was something new when it was introduced in the Quaker Church at Bristol in 1678.[5] The increased organization and authority of the Ministers' Meetings aroused a jealousy on the part of the people; in 1697 six Friends were appointed in Bristol to represent the church in the Ministers' Meeting, and in 1699, "'two weighty, understanding Friends'" from each church were appointed to attend the Ministers' Meetings and "to give account to the church 'from time to time, what satisfaction they have with Friends in the ministry, both as to their life and conversation, and also as to their doctrines.'"[6]

In 1700, Burnet makes the following evaluation of the 1689 Settlement:

1. Barclay, Religious Societies, pp. 384-385.
2. Russell, op. cit., p. 194.
3. Ibid., p. 196.
4. Ut per Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 400.
5. Vide Ibid., pp. 399-400.
6. Ibid., pp. 510-511.

> The Toleration, of all the sects among us, had made us live more quietly together of late, than could be expected, when severe Laws were rigorously executed against Dissenters. No tumults or disorder had been heard of in any part of the Kingdom, these eleven years, since that Act passed: and yet the much greater part of the clergy studied to blow up this fire again, which seemed to be now, as if it were covered over with ashes.[1]

The hatred which the non-jurors held toward Bishop Burnet and other Latitudinarians or Low Churchmen "in no way abated with time," and the High Churchmen watched for every chance to get revenge on the Whigs. The continued efforts of the French king to reimpose James upon England "rendered the wars of William and Marlborough unavoidable."[2] As William and Mary had no children, there was great concern for securing the throne against the Catholic Pretender and for settling the question of succession, especially as there were many who favored restoring the Stuarts. In 1700 an Act of Succession incapacitated all Roman Catholics from inheriting the Crown and required the ruling sovereign to "join in communion with the Church of England" and to secure "the rights and liberties of the people;" Princess Anne of Denmark was named to succeed King William (Mary having died in 1694) and Princess Sophia of Hanover and her Protestant heirs were to follow.[3] With the accession of Queen Anne to the throne in 1702, the Tory party began their agitation to modify the Revolution settlement; Trevelyan says that it was not their desire "to raise the Catholics but to depress the Dissenters; not to restore absolutism, but to extend squirearchy."[4] Trevelyan tells us:

> Addison's Tory publican 'had not time to go to church himself, but . . . had headed a mob at the pulling down of two or three meeting-houses,' while his patron, the Foxhunter, 'had learned a great deal of politics, but not one word of religion, from the parson of

1. Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, p. 247.
2. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 486.
3. Gee & Hardy, Documents, CXXIV, pp. 664-670.
4. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 392.

his parish; and, indeed, he had scarce any other notion of religion, but that it consisted in hating Presbyterians.[1]

The Test and Corporation Acts barred from all military and civil offices those who did not receive Communion according to the Anglican order; to escape this restriction there grew up a practice among the Nonconformists of occasionally attending the Anglican service and receiving Communion while they attended their own services regularly. Hutton describes this practice as "the horrible profanation" of the holy sacrament by "unconscientious dissenters,"[2] but Trevelyan remarks that "legislators who had made the sacrament a State test had no right to call the practice indecent."[3] Under William the Tories had no chance of doing anything to prevent this evasion, but in 1702 they introduced in Parliament a bill against Occasional Conformity which was lost after long debate. In 1703 it was reintroduced, its proponents crying that the church was endangered by the hypocrisy of occasional conformity while its opponents argued that such a bill would stir up troubles and ill humors; the House of Lords defeated it.[4] In 1704 its supporters failed to merge it with the money-bill, and in 1704 it was debated before the queen; its proponents spoke of danger from Scottish Presbyterianism and Dissenters' schools, while its opponents declared that toleration had softened the tempers of the Dissenters and that their numbers were "visibly decreasing."[5] At the conclusion of the debate it was voted that the Church was "safe and peaceful" and that those who insinuated otherwise were enemies to the queen, the church and the kingdom.[6] However, when Mrs. Masham replaced the Duchess

1. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 395.
2. Hutton, op. cit., p. 258.
3. Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 403.
4. Vide Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, pp. 336-338.
5. Ibid., pp. 401, 434-435.
6. Vide Hutton, op. cit., pp. 259-260.

of Marlborough as the queen's confidant, the power of the Tory party began to increase; changes were made in Queen Anne's ministry, and High Churchmen were appointed to the vacant bishoprics. On November 5, 1709, Dr. Henry Sacheverell preached a sermon at St. Paul's, in which he declared that the church was in danger, notwithstanding the vote of Parliament; he denounced the mayors, magistrates and bishops (especially Burnet, Bishop of Sarum) who favored toleration as lacking in zeal for the church and said that as the Whigs formerly labored "'to bring the Church into the conventicle, now they labour to bring the conventicle into the Church, which will prove its inevitable ruin.'"[1] Dr. Sacheverell was summoned to the bar and by the House of Lords was suspended from preaching for three years. This was on the eve of the 1710 election, and the Tories used the fiascee of this trial and sentence to their advantage; the High Churchmen pressed the people to save their Church, telling them that the queen was in captivity to her late ministry and must be rescued. Burnet was shocked by the practices and violence used in this election which swept the Tories into office.[2] The Whigs minority worked to save their settlement of the European war, the Dissenters toleration and the Hanoverian succession; they lost the first, compromised on the second but won the third. For a time, the House of Lords was able to check the Occasional Conformity Bill, but in 1711 the leader of the High Churchmen "made an unprincipled bargain with the Whigs in the House of Lords,"[3] and the bill was passed. All persons in "Places of Profit and Trust, and all the Common-Council Men in Corporations" who should attend any meeting for

1. Ut per Hutton, op. cit., p. 261.
2. Vide Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, pp. 554-558.
3. Vide Trevelyan, Stuarts, p. 422.

divine worship in which Common Prayer was not used became subject to forfeit their office and to pay forty pounds to the informer.[1] The queen's ministry did not resign as had been expected; instead, twelve Tory Peers were created, the Duke of Marlborough was removed from the head of the army and England was withdrawn from the European war. Under Bolingbroke's leadership, the Tories worked to crush the Whigs and Dissenters and to fill all civil and military offices with High Tories and Jacobites. Thinking if they could destroy the Dissenting Academies, they would reduce nonconformity to the poor and ignorant within a generation, the Tories passed the Schism Act (1714) which restricted all teaching to those licensed by the bishops under a threat of three months imprisonment.[2] Trevelyan says that this Act, if it had been enforced, would have extirpated Dissent in the next generation or led to Civil War.[3] On the Sunday, August 1, 1714, when the Schism Act went into effect, Bishop Burnet met Thomas Bradbury, the pastor of the Independent Church in Fetter Lane, walking across Smithfield, and asked him why he was looking so grave; Bradbury replied,

> 'I am thinking whether I shall have the constancy and resolution of that noble company of martyrs whose ashes are deposited in this place; for I most assuredly expect to see similar times of violence and persecution, and that I shall be called to suffer in a like cause.'[4]

Burnet told him that the queen was dying and that he would send a messenger to his church if she died that morning. In the meantime Bolingbroke was working frantically to secure the support of the army so that he could choose either to restore the Stuart Pretender or to dictate terms to the Hanoverian heir, whose favor the Whigs already had won, but his

1. Vide Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, pp. 584-585.
2. Dale, op. cit., pp. 503-504.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 500.
4. Ut per Dale, op. cit., pp. 505-506.

time was running out. That very morning, August 1, 1714, while Bradbury was preaching, a man hurried into the congregation and dropped a handkerchief over the front of the gallery; the preacher concluded his sermon with a prayer, invoking God's blessings upon "'George, King of Great Britain and Ireland.'"[1]

As a group of Dissenting ministers, dressed in black Genevan cloaks, moved toward George I, on the day of his accession, someone asked if this were a funeral; to which Bradbury replied, "'No, my lord, it is a Resurrection.'"[2] Despite this hope, nonconformity continued to weaken, although their party, the Whigs, stayed in power for forty-seven years; the Schism and Occasional Conformity Acts were repealed, but the other restrictions remained. Trevelyan says:

> Walpole, who held power from 1721 to 1742, had the sense to see that the Whigs would retain office for themselves and keep the House of Hanover on the throne, only if they left the privileges of the Church untouched, and allowed the government of the countryside to rest very largely in the hands of Tory Justices of the Peace. Under Whig political rule at St. James's and Westminster, the Church and the squirearchy preserved what was nearest and dearest to them in the county, the parish, and the University.
>
> That compromise secured the Pax Walpoliana, and saved the House of Hanover from overthrow by the Jacobites.[3]

Although they were the main supporters of the House of Hanover, the Dissenters were often treated as poor relatives whose presence and petitions embarrassed the Whig leaders; finally in 1723, Walpole silenced the persistent Dissenting ministers with the Regium Donum. Nine ministers of "great respectability" were chosen from "the three denominations" (Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist) to serve as trustees to a fund,

1. Ut per Dale, op. cit., pp. 505-506.
2. Dale, op. cit., p. 515.
3. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., pp. 503-504.

created by his majesty for the relief of the distressed Dissenting clergy and their families.[1] The opposition to receiving this money for poor ministers and their widows was overcome, and the complaints and applications of the Nonconformists were silenced. In speaking of the Nonconformist of this period, Barclay says that

> piety, seasoned with knowledge and skill, was required to maintain the position of the ministry amid the political complication of the times, rather than religious Zeal, which they feared might shipwreck their cause. . . . We can hardly wonder that the whole influence of those who guided the affairs of these Churches, was exerted towards the quiet enjoyment of their newly-acquired privileges, and to excite as little as possible the apprehensions of the Established Church. Any other course might have embarrassed the Government.[2]

The eighteenth century brought a new religious climate to England; religion was "displaced from the centre of interest," and men turned to science, commerce, politics and other things; the fundamentals of Christianity were reduced by the Deists "to the mere essentials of natural reason," and morality sank to a low level.[3] Dr. M'Crie gives the following description of this development:

> '. . . A spiritual blight, affecting alike the interests of the truth and of religious life, for which many causes may be assigned, but which it is difficult to explain in any other way than by supposing the withdrawal of God's Spirit from the Churches of the Reformation, swept over the whole of Europe. In England the change was soon apparent, though the process was gradual. The approach of doctrinal laxity was heralded by laud paeans in praise of what was termed Christian charity. Pamphlets began to appear in defence of "the innocency of mental error," and in which the "fundamentals" of religion were reduced within narrow bounds, and nothing was to be heard but of "the light of nature, reason, and the fitness of things." Step by step the descent was made, from the highest Arianism to the lowest Socinianism.'[4]

The Nonconformists shared in this general decline of religion. Handicapped by the exclusion from the Universities, the education of their

1. Vide Dale, op. cit., p. 524. This grant continued until 1851.
2. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 591.
3. Underwood, op. cit., p. 117.
4. Dr. M'Crie, Annals of English Presbytery, (pp. 297, 298), Ut per Drysdale, op. cit., pp. 491-492.

ministers suffered in spite of their own excellent academies and schools, and many of their young men continued to join the Established Church for political and social advantages; in 1732 the three denominations of Protestant Dissenters formed "a society for the protection of the rights of Dissenters" and began agitating for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.[1] In the meantime the nonconformist preachers had become "inoffensive and agreeable people, and it is said that it was possible to doze quietly during the sermons of these successors to the fiery Puritans;"[2] the rationalistic emphasis of their time influenced their preaching, and the semi-Arian and Unitarian controversies divided and weakened them. In his immature Enquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest, Strickland Gough, a young student who went over to the Church of England, declared that the two main causes of the decline were (1) ignorance of their own principles and (2) an ill conduct and management of their own interests. Gough states that because the people fail to support those ministers who preach 'disagreeable truths,' the 'best' of the Dissenting ministers were forced to enter the Church of England, leaving men 'whose births and hopes' were 'low' to carry on the Dissenting churches. He recommends that more emphasis should be placed on 'rational worship,' that a dancing tutor be employed at the academy to give the ministerial students "'a gracefulness and gentility of address, and prune off all clumsiness and awkwardness that is disagreeable to people of fashion'" and that two separate congregations be formed, one for the 'generous people' who hold 'free principles' and another for the 'bigoted' people who cling to the old ways.[3] Dale says that whether the Dissenters were increasing or

1. Dale, op. cit., p. 519.
2. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 591.
3. Ut per Dale, op. cit., pp. 547-550 passim.

decreasing, the impression produced by this pamphlet is "a decisive proof that . . . the 'Dissenting Interest' was in danger of losing all the noblest elements of its life and vigour."[1] Many Dissenting ministers questioned that their number was declining; Doddridge claimed that he knew many congregations in the Midlands which had "'greatly increased within these twenty years,'" and Isaac Watts said that "'whatsoever decrease may have appeared in some places, there have been sensible advances in others.'"[2] The anonymous writer of Some observations upon the Present State of the Dissenting Interest (1731) said that since trade had declined in the southern counties, Dissent had also declined there as it was chiefly of "'the middling and trading people.'" He expressed regret of the practice of Dissenting parents placing their children under High Church schoolmasters; he felt that too much respect had been paid to 'strolling Scotch ministers' and that in a policy of moderation toward the Church of England, important differences had been passed over as if they were not significant; but he acknowledged that the real root of the evil was the decline of religious earnestness.[3] In Spiritual Declensions (1732), Abraham Taylor attributed this loss of religious earnestness to the gradual departure of the Dissenters from the old faith; soon after the Toleration, he said, there began a decline of doctrinal preaching in favor of more "practical preaching;" the people

> 'were told a great deal of the advantage of curbing their passions, of the present benefits of sobermindedness, or the rewardability of sincerity, let a man's opinions be what they would. As this way of preaching grew in use, Christ was very much left out, and some seemed to take pleasure, in being able to spin out an empty harangue, the length of an hour, without mentioning His name.'[4]

1. Dale, op. cit., p. 552.
2. Ut per Dale, op. cit., pp. 552-553.
3. Dale, op. cit., pp. 552-553.
4. Ut per Dale, op. cit., p. 555.

Isaac Watts, likewise, held that the main cause of the decline of Dissent was "'the decay of vital religion in the hearts of men, and the little success which the ministrations of the Gospel have had of late in the conversion of sinners.'"[1]

Even the Particular Baptists who earlier had not let their Calvinism abate their evangelical zeal came to adopt "'the non-invitation, non-application scheme;'" Underwood says that "hyper-Calvinism did its deadly work among the Baptists, as well as among the Presbyterians and Independents."[2] Many of these 'high-and-dry' preachers became ashamed of their relation to tradesmen, and assumed 'an air of respectability,' which separated them from the poor of their congregations. The General Baptists also suffered in this decline of evangelical fervor, and their system of travelling evangelists gradually died out. As the older ones dropped out, it became increasingly difficult to get young men to take their places; "many churches refused to surrender their elder or pastor for this work,"[3] and its financial uncertainty seems to have frightened the younger men away from undertaking it. In 1705 the Kent Association proposed to the General Assembly that a fund be established for the ministry as a means of remedying the "'sinking and languishing condition'" of many of their churches, but this proposal was modified so as to apply only to those "'elders and gifted brethren that are in want and not supplied other ways.'"[4] The messengers who did go out to preach came to depend more and more upon the meager common fund for their support and were subjected to increasing criticism for interfering with the independency of the local

1. Isaac Watts, "An Humble Attempt towards the Revival of Practical Religion among Christians," Works, iv., 585, as quoted by Dale, op. cit., p. 556.
2. Underwood, op. cit., p. 135.
3. Ibid., p. 121.
4. Ut per Underwood, op. cit., pp. 125-126.

church.[1] Confined almost entirely to rural communities, the General Baptists suffered greatly from the lack of trained and progressive leadership; they met mostly in the homes of their church officers, and their churches often disintegrated upon the death or removal of their leader. Underwood says that "their vitality was drained away when their body was prevaded by Socinianism."[2] It was said of one of their preachers that he had "'contributed to promote the knowledge of rational religion, awaken attention to free inquiry, and cherish just and liberal sentiments;'" under such preaching, their churches dwindled, and whole associations of General Baptists "simply fell to pieces."[3]

The Quakers also suffered from the general religious decline and experienced many internal developments which older leaders like Margaret Fell Fox regretted to see.[4] Their former evangelistic fervor cooled into quietism, and the children of those who preached to the 'wickedest people in the country' were told that they might invite their 'sober and well-inclined neighbours' to their meetings. In 1724, the decline in their meetings was attributed "'in some measure to the want of a lively and spiritual ministry amongst us,'" but, as Barclay says, the next few words in the Kent report show "the working of the new leaven: 'we hope there's those amongst us come further than to have their dependency in words.'"[5] In the Yearly Meeting of 1738 those who complained of "the decline in both the quantity and quality of the ministry supplied to them" were advised in their meeting "'to feel their minds abstracted from visible objects into a true stillness and nothingness of self;'" Barclay says

1. In 1775 Adam Taylor denounced their office as the "Inquisitor-general." Vide Underwood, op. cit., p. 121.
2. Underwood, op. cit., p. 127.
3. Ibid., p. 128.
4. Vide Barclay, Religious Societies, pp. 499-501.
5. Ut per Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 513.

this development resulted in the want of sound Christian instruction at the very time when rationalistic thinking was permeating society.[1] Troubled by "'the apparent declension, in our time, of true piety and godly zeal'" the Quaker leaders began to legislate and to supervise the details of their members lives; 'overseers' were appointed to enforce an outward uniformity in dress, household furnishing, business management and recreation. Barclay says that the whole life of man from the ornaments on his cradle to the covering of his coffin, was legislated by the church; as a youth, the church saw that he learned a useful trade and "exercised a watchful care lest he should fall into sin, by marrying 'one of the world's children;'" as a man, his financial accounts and manufactured goods were inspected, his wife rebuked for growing flowers and himself disowned for 'playing at gowff.'[2] Margaret Fell Fox warned that 'legal ceremonies are far from Gospel freedom' and that men might get 'into an outward garb' without being true Christians;[3] however, less attention continued to be given to spiritual teaching and Christian influence and more power was given to church censure. The desire to uphold a man in his business led to inspecting his private accounts; the desire to help the poor members led to the scorning of the poor. The Poor Laws, whereby each congregation was to care for its own needy, led to the further decline of evangelism; Barclay says, "a pecuniary liability" came to be attached to an increase number of members, and "an additional reason was thus furnished for curtailing the strong Home Missionary

1. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 514.
2. Vide Barclay, Religious Societies, pp. 492-498. It must be noted, as Barclay points out, that the Quakers undertook this experiment voluntarily; as long as men sought the good of their souls above all else, it could be reported: 'things are better among us than before this strict and close discipline was established.'
3. Ibid., pp. 499-501.

element."[1] The birthright membership grew out of the difficulty experienced in the London Yearly Meeting of 1737 in determining the responsibility for some particular needy Friends; the minutes of this meeting declare:

> 'All Friends shall be deemed members of the Quarterly, Monthly and Two-Weeks meeting within the compass of which they inhabited or dwelt the first day of the Fourth Month, 1737 . . . and the wife and children to be deemed members of the Monthly Meeting of which the husband or father is a member, not only during his life but after his decease.'[2]

Russell says that while it likely was intented only that the children of Friends should be cared for as members when in need, they came to be counted as members for all purposes; thus membership became more related to birth than to conviction, and the evangelistic effort with its itinerant preachers grew useless.[3]

While this decline of religious interest and spirituality is noticeable from the time of the restoration, it would be a mistake to overlook the noble efforts of many to revive men's devotion. Burnet says:

> In King James's Reign, the fear of Popery was so strong, as well as just, that many, in and about London, began to meet often together, both for Devotion, and for their further Instruction: Things of that kind had been formerly practised, only among the Puritans and the Dissenters: But these were of the Church, and came to their Ministers, to be assisted with Forms of Prayer and other directions: They were chiefly conducted by Dr. Deveridge and Dr. Horneck. Some disliked this, and were afraid it might be the Original of new Factions and Parties; but wiser and better men thought, it was not fit nor decent to check a spirit of Devotion, at such a time.[4]

Under William and Mary these societies grew more numerous; their members informed the magistrates of swearers, drunkards, profaners of the Lord's Day and of keepers of lewd houses;

1. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 521.
2. Ut per Russell, op. cit., p. 215.
3. Vide Russell, op. cit., p. 216.
4. Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, p. 317.

> they threw in the part of the Fine, given by Law to Informers, into a stock of Charity: From this, they were called Societies of Reformation: Some good Magistrates encouraged them; but others treated them roughly.[1]

Both the queen and the king encouraged these societies by letters and proclamation, but their orders were often slighted by the inferior magistrates and made of little account by many of the High Churchmen. Other societies were formed

> to raise Charity Schools, for teaching poor Children, for cloathing them and binding them out to Trades; Many Books were printed, and sent over the Nation by them, to be freely distributed: These were called Societies for propagating Christian Knowledge: By this means, some thousands of Children are now well educated and carefully looked after. . . . At last a Corporation was created by the late King, for propagating the Gospel among Infidels, for settling Schools in our Plantations, for furnishing the Clergy that were sent thither, and for sending Missionaries among such of our Plantations, as were not able to provide Pastors for themselves.[2]

Queen Anne encouraged these societies, Hutton says that by 1710 there were forty-two of them in London and Westminster alone and that the whole literature of the time bears witness to the good work which they did.[3] Hundreds of Charity Schools were founded all over England, and Bibles and other religious literature were distributed in the army and fleet and were made available throughout the country.[4] Whitley says that these Religious Societies saved religion in England during the eighteenth century; they were

> composed almost entirely of laymen, so that the ministers looked decidedly askance at them; it was another instance that when the clergy grew cold & official, God will raise others to rejunvenate the land.[5]

Hutton says that "the political changes and the low moral tone of the

1. Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, p. 318.
2. Ibid., pp. 318-319.
3. Hutton, op. cit., p. 305.
4. Vide Trevelyan, Social History, p. 329 for other activities and accomplishments.
5. Whitley, British Baptists, p. 211.

early Hanoverians exercised a depressing effect on them;"[1] and Barclay says that during the period of 1713 to 1739, "true religion was never perhaps at a lower ebb."[2] London bargemen like Jonathan Brown could confess that they "'had never so much as heard who or what Christ was'"[3] at a time when Baptist ministers were having their portraits painted as "respectable citizens" and when Quaker leaders were recommending silence in their meetings.[4] However, the Societies succeeded in preparing the way and the men for another religious awakening when again the plain gospel of salvation would be preached to the poor in the highways and byways by honest tradesmen, called of God and directed by His servant, John Wesley.

1. Hutton, op. cit., p. 306.
2. Barclay, Religious Societies, p. 516.
3. Trevelyan, Social History, p. 331.
4. Vide Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 519.

CONCLUSION

We have seen lay-preaching rise from the head-waters of Lollardry and have followed its winding course through the Reformation into the Puritan movement; we have witnessed its increasing power through the Separatists and have seen its rapid expanse during the political and social storms of mid-seventeenth century. We have observed its threatening flood during the Commonwealth and have noted the efforts made to control and channel it; we have seen its subsiding and dwindling into a mere trickle by the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Having discussed these changes in connection with the political, social and general religious conditions of their time, it now remains for us to attempt an evaluation of their significance.

The first emphasis of our study was upon the development of lay-preaching, which we may summarize by noting the chief factors in its rise, the first of which might be described as (1) the ministers' failure to fulfill their office or mission. In the time of Wycliffe, if we care to reach back that far, the priestly function of the clergy was over-emphasized to the exclusion of the prophetic function; at the time of the Puritan agitation, the pulpit oratory of the official clergy was unintelligble to the common people and uninspiring to those who could understand it. The writer of Vox Militaris (1647) acknowledges

> 'that through the want of honest, able and godly ministers in our army, the soldiers have endeavoured the mutual edification one of another, by exhortation on the Lord's days (without permission whereof we should scarce have had so much as any solemn form of godliness found amongst us).'[1]

1. Ut per Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 336.

After the Restoration the clergy of the Established Church adopted the plain practical style of preaching but it soon developed into a rationalization of the Christian faith; Trevelyan says that the common people "were not likely to be much impressed by arguments based on Butler's Analogy and by the sweet reasonableness of a learned religion."[1] After the persecutions Nonconformists became quieter, economically more prosperous and socially more "respectable;" while they continued to serve the needs of the poor in some areas,[2] the great majority of the poor were neglected until the Wesleyan revival, in which lay-preachers had an important part. (2) The second major factor in the rise of lay-preaching was the rediscovery of the Bible and the importance given unto it as the supreme inspired word of God; men not only absorbed its main teachings but endeavored to copy its details. It was inevitable that during this period of intense Bible study men should wonder at the calling of Old Testament prophets and the prophesying in the early Christian churches until some experienced similar callings and sought to reinstitute what they deemed an apostolic ordinance. If men believed that God spoke to them through His Written Word, it was inevitable that some would speak out what they thought was revealed to them through it and that in time some would claim a direct revelation apart from the Word. Sir Thomas More was perhaps right; it all started with giving the Scriptures to the people. (3) The rise of an independent and prosperous middle class encouraged the development of individualism which might be reckoned as the third major factor in the rise of lay-preaching. With the breakdown of medieval society, tradesmen and merchants assumed a financial inde-

1. Trevelyan, Hist. of Engl., p. 519.
2. Vide Ibid.

pendence and developed a marked individualism. Many of this new middle class were very religious and assisted the Protestant and Puritan causes. Conscientious in their study of the Scriptures and troubled by the conditions about them, many experienced a call to proclaim a neglected gospel to a neglected people. In many respects their experiences were similar to those of monks and hermits of the Middle Ages, but the preaching of seventeenth century tradesmen was, on the whole, more independent and more individualistic. (4) The political, social and religious upheavals between 1500 and 1738 intensified the spiritual longings of the people and increased their need of religious security; these conditions favored the rise of a host of prophets whose hearts were moved in human compassion and divine devotion. (5) While it may seem improper for a historian to speak of the divine factor, yet it would be amiss to omit it. The men of our study professed receiving a divine call and commission; whether they did or not, is beside the point; in their own consciousness this belief was the compelling factor which forced them to leave home and work to preach the Word.

Lay-preaching varied so greatly during the period of our study that it is difficult to summarize its main characteristics, and yet there are marked similarities among the fugitive "teachers" of "known men," the public Bible-readers, the Separatist preachers, the Independent prophesying elders, the Baptist messengers and the Quaker publishers. For the most part, they were tradesmen or "the honest poor" who had received little or no formal education above the elementary knowledge of reading and writing; they were men of intense devotion and heroic courage who defied their persecutors to preach the Word. At times they

were rude, but the message in their hearts was so urgent that they could not always be polite. (If at times, they seemed over-wrought; let us remember that some of the Old Testament prophets had also seemed so). They preached in homes and shops, fields and markets, conventicles and churches; wherever men gathered,they came to preach to them, or they came and gathered men to their preaching. At times their sermons were wild and strange, and sometimes they set forth new and varied doctrines; however, the greater part of their preaching was of simple Bible-truths, quickened by their own experiences and illustrated by examples from their work and common observation. Although they spent much time in denouncing the official clergy and others who varied from their own views, the predominant note of their preaching was evangelical. Their language was simple and plain; they opposed pulpit oratory in favor of gospel-preaching. In fact, they were suspicious and hostile toward all "human learning;" the universities had political and social affiliations which alienated the poor, and the education which they did offer was unrelated to the needs of the people. In contrast to "human learning," our preachers professed a divine enlightenment which always was regarded as superior to "human learning" and at times was considered its replacement. Most of the lay-preaching of our study was related to the anti-clericalism of its day; coming in opposition to an official religion, it often appeared heretical, schismatic and dangerous to the established order and so incurred the hostility and wrath of the guardians of the establishment. This was not the first time that prophet clashed with priest or that the charismatic and institutional elements of religion warred against each other.[1] In the long debate on the toleration of lay-preaching, there

1. Vide R. A. Knox, Enthusiasm (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), 1-8.

were many who advocated a spirit of cooperation between the ministers and "gifted men," and in three denominations the two, for a time, were reconciled.

In attempting to evaluate the lay-preaching of our study, let us first consider what these preachers accomplished, the place they filled and the contribution they made. (1) Although there were cases of error and harm, we cannot ignore the testimony of those who heard them and professed receiving benefit from them. John Bunyan was surely an exception, but as we know the blessings which have accompanied his writings, can we doubt but that some good was done by his preaching? Even the opponents of Cromwell's army had to confess that it was well behaved and exhibited a remarkable degree of sobriety; surely Cromwell's discipline was an important factor, but the preaching of captains and corporals played a significant part in that discipline. We have mentioned the neglect of the poor and the unpopularity of the official clergy; did not these men go to the poor and preach the Gospel, thus endeavoring to fulfil one of the tasks which our Lord acknowledged as a part of His divine mission?[1] The poor heard these preachers and followed them. As a second contribution, we may suggest (2) the possible influence which lay-preachers had upon the change from the "learned" oratory of the English pulpit to the plain preaching which was widely adopted after the Restoration. Of course, many factors entered into this transition, but Burnet says that the Nonconformist preachers "contributed more than can be well imagined to reform the way of preaching."[2] Baxter tells us that the

1. Luke 4:18-19.
2. Burnet, Own Times, vol. II, p. 191.

masses of the people always have been "greatly taken with a Preacher that speaketh to them in a familiar natural Language, and exhorteth them as if it were for their Lives;" Mitchell adds that "such preachers the Independents and Anabaptists provided."[1] Many of the Independent and Baptist preachers were tradesmen who could not quote the church fathers in their original languages; they only could quote the English Bible. They could not make classical allusions; they only could give examples from common experience. They could not display in flowery language some obscure theological point; they only could tell what they did "smartingly feel" and point the way to Christ. The spoke in the only language they knew--the language of the people whom they addressed, and "English" pleased the ears of Englishmen. Mitchell says that Tillotson was successful in influencing the style of preaching, because of "the demands of popular taste;"[2] is it amiss to suppose that trade-preachers had had a part in creating those demands? (3) Their influence in reviving certain mystical aspects which had been ignored in the harsher theological and political emphasis of early Protestantism might be listed as a third contribution. In the times of great institutionalism and bibliolatry, their experience of a divine Call renewed a warmth and tenderness in religion which had been lacking; they brought a new awareness of the Spirit and encouraged men to seek after a living Presence.[3] (4) While in some respects they were products of a new individualism, these preachers, in turn, encouraged the development of this individualism by emphasizing the responsibility which accompanies all gifts and graces. The parable of the talents

1. Mitchell, op. cit., p. 371.
2. Ibid., p. 117.
3. Vide Knox, op. cit., p. 581 for the contrast between the "mystical" and the "evangelical enthusiasts." This distinction seems not to hold in regard to many of our preachers.

(Matt. 25:14-30) was their favorite Scripture; they not only justified their preaching by it, but they used it to encourage others to use whatever abilities they had for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God. They emphasized personal responsibility in evangelism and gave the great Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of believers a new interpretation. No longer was it enough to say prayers or even to enjoy salvation; men came to feel an obligation to serve the Lord they worshiped and to share the good news of salvation. (5) The debate concerning lay-preaching involved the right of dissent and the freedom of expression. If this struggle for the freedom of preaching had been lost, the silent thoughts of men would have been meaningless. If only approved preachers had been allowed to mount pulpits, it is not likely that orators would have been permitted to get up on soap-boxes. If the voices of dissenting preachers had been silenced, the pens of dissenting writers would also have been stopped. The preaching rights of private men were closely related to the very idea of toleration, and the victory of toleration was, in part, due to their heroism and courage. The freedom of the pulpit was the mother of the freedoms of conscience, speech and press.

It is regrettable that the lay-preaching of our study was often associated with the anti-clericalism of its day; while we may understand this, yet we must list it as one of its chief defects. While there was, perhaps, a need of rebuking "the Sadducees and Pharisees" of their day, yet we cannot but think that their harshness robbed them of a fuller message and spirit. We may agree with them that the ministers held no monopoly of God's Spirit, but we also sympathize with the ministers who asked if God might not speak through them also. (2) A second fault or

weakness which we find in the lay-preaching of our study is the extreme individualism and uncontrolled zeal which it often manifested. This danger was latent in the very nature of the movement, and although the way was indicated at the close of the debate, no satisfactory supervision was established to control it. The Congregationalists, Baptists and Quakers evolved regulations and organizations, but the persecutions after the Restoration disrupted them. At times there was reason for the fear of anarchy; not only did the stories of the German Anabaptists keep this fear alive, but even the defenders of lay-preaching recognized that there were people of unsuitable temperament and questionable morals who claimed the freedom to preach. As William Campell points out, "the spirit of eccentric individualism . . . found expression in the multifarious sects, creeds, fantasies and fanaticism of the age;" not only may the "Scottish Anti-Toleration policy" be described as "a measure of self-defence albeit a mistaken and violent one,"[1] but it may be described as a faulty effort to safeguard the peace and order of society itself. (3) A third weakness of the lay-preaching which we have studied was its suspicion and hostility toward education. Some of the leaders who encouraged others to prophesy were educated men who, in addition to their natural and acquired gifts, were sensitive to the Voice of God speaking through others, but others came who despised "human learning" and spoke as if God could only speak through themselves. Both the General Baptists and the Quakers suffered because of their sole dependence upon a lay-leadership. It is true that the universities were closed to the Nonconformists after 1689, but before that date there was little effort made to train and equip the lay-preach-

1. William Campell, "The Scottish Westminster Commissioners and Toleration," Records of the Scottish Church History Society, (vol. IX, Part 1, 1945), pp. 1, 18.

ers for their task. Surely "spiritual knowledge" is important, but it does not necessarily dispense with "human knowledge." There is a place for the prophetic cry and the testimony of the lowest, but those who undertake to teach others should be conscientious in preparing themselves to receive divine inspiration and to divide the word of Truth aright (II Tim. 2:15). There must always be a place for the wandering apostle, but there must also be a place for the secluded scholar; or else how shall the unlearned preacher know the written Word unless it be translated for him? (4) A fourth danger was inherent in the efforts to popularize the Gospel; in trying to reach the people in their language and expressions, our preachers at times "vulgarized" the holy and eternal. This may be true of all preachers; when we speak of God, we cannot tell all of His holiness or love, and in speaking in parts we cheapen the Eternal. However, the satire and criticism of the "tub-preachers" might not have been entirely without cause, and we trust that the advice often given to some to practice more privately was not in vain. These inherent weaknesses had their effect upon the decline of lay-preaching, but we must also mention the general decline of religious interest which affected all of Europe in the early part of the eighteenth century; anything of religious enthusiasm was suspected and the spiritual climate did not nourish the devotion out of which lay-preaching arose. Another important element in its decline was the development within the denominations which first had fostered it; Knox says, "always the first fervours evaporate; prophecy dies out, and the charismatic is merged in the institutional."[1]

1. Knox, op. cit., p. 1.

While we cannot give a final judgment upon the lay-preaching of our study, we may point out that John Wesley in his use of lay-preachers incorporated some of its finer aspects and avoided many of its dangers and that today in England there are thousands of Methodist and Baptist lay-preachers who work in the spirit of cordial friendship with their pastors and ministers. Since our interest began there, it will not be amiss also to mention that on a recent visit to Germany we were told that in the East conscientious laymen are endeavoring to fill those places left vacant by their pastors. However, their stories do not belong to this study, but they indicate its significance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

An/Order/Made by the House of Commons/for the Establishing of Preaching Lectures, through the King/dome of England and Wales./Passed before the Rising, Septemb. 8, 1641. London: by B. Alsop, 1641.

Baillie, Robert. Letters and Journals. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Alex Lawie & Co., 1841.

Baylie (Baillie), Robert. A/Dissvasive/From the/Errours/of the/Time: . . . (10 lines). London:for Samuel Gellibrand, 1646.

Baillie, Robert. Anabaptism,/the/Trve Fovntaine/of/Independency, Antinomy,/Brownisme,/Familisme,/And the most of the other Errours, which for the time/doe trouble the Church of England,/Vnsealed. . . . (13 lines). London: by M. F., 1647.

Ball, Thomas. Pastorum Propugnaculum./or, The/Pulpits Patronage/Against the Force of/Un-ordained Usurpation,/and Invasion. . . . (8 lines). London: by S. G., 1656.

Barclay, Robert. The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876.

Barclay, Robert. An Apology for the True Christian Divinity; Being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People called Quakers. 10th ed. London: Harvey and Darton, 1841.

Bewick, John. An/Antidote/Against/Lay-Preaching,/or The Preachers Plea. . . . (13 lines). London: for Andrew Crook, 1642.

Boreman, Robert. The Triumph/of/Learning/Over/Ignorance,/And of/Truth over Falsehood. . . . (19 lines). London: for R. Royston, 1653.

Brothers of the Separation/or,/a True Relation of a Company of Brow/nists which kept their Conventicle at one Mr./Porters in Goat Alley in Whitecrosse-street,/where they were apprehended on Sunday, Aug. 14, 1641. . . . (6 lines). London: by Tho. Harper, 1641.

Brownists Conventicle:/or an Assembly of Brownists, Separatists, and Non-Confor/mists, . . . (9 lines). 1641.

Bunyan, John. The Entire Works of John Bunyan. Edited by Henry Stebbing. 4 vols. London: James S. Virtue, 1864.

Burnet, Bishop. History/of/His Own Time./Vol. I/From the Restoration of King Charles II./To The/Settlement of King William and Queen Mary/ at the Revolution:/To which is prefix'd/A Summary Recapitulation of affairs in Church and State from King James I to the Restoration in the Year 1660. London: for Thomas Ward, 1724.

Cardwell, Edward. Documentary Annals of the reformed Church of England. new ed. 2 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1844.

Cartwright, Thomas. A/Directory/of/Church-government./Anciently contended for, and as/farre as the Times would suffer, practised/by the first Non-conformists in the daies of Queen Elizabeht. . . . (4 lines). London: for John Wright, 1644.

Chillendon, Edmund. Preaching/Without/Ordination/or,/a Treatise proving the lawfulnesse/of all Persons, of what Degree, Ranke, or Trade soever,/being inabled with sufficient guifts and qualifica-/tions from God by his Spirit, to preach/and set forth the Gospel, though no/Minister nor any other officer/in the Church of God. . . . (7 lines). London: for George Whittington, 1647.

Collier, Thomas. A brief/discovery/of the corruption of the ministry of/the Church of England: . . . (7 lines). London: by T. C., 1647.

Collier, Thomas. The/Pulpit-Guard Routed,/In Its/Twenty Strong-Holds./or,/A brief Answer, To a large and lawless Discourse, Writen by one Tho. Hall of Kings-Norton, Inti-tuled, The Pulpit-Guarded, with Twenty Arguments, Pretending/to prove the unlawfulness, and sinfulness of Private mens Preaching. . . . (18 lines). London: for the author.

Collinges, John. Responsoria ad Erratica Pastoris,/Sive,/Vindiciae Vindicarum./Id Est,/The Sheperds Wandrings discovered,/in a Revindication of the great Ordinance of/God: Gospel-Preachers, and Preaching./By way of Reply and Answer to a late Booke,/called, The Peoples priviledges, and duty guarded against the Pulpit and Preachers encroachment. . . . (15 lines). London: for R. Tomlins, 1652.

Colling[e]s, John. Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici;/A Vindication of the great ordinance of God/viz. A Gospel-Ministry; . . . (19 lines). London: for Rich. Tomlins, 1651.

Colling[e]s, John. Vindiciae Ministerii Evanglici Revindicatae; or the Preacher (pretendedly)Sent, Sent back again, . . . (16 lines). Published by J. M., 1658.

Cook, John. What the/Independents would have, . . . (7 lines). London: for Giles Calvert, 1647.

Couling, N. The Saints/Perfect/in this Life/or Never. . . . (3 lines). London: for Giles Calvert, 1647.

Cranmer, Thomas. Miscellaneous Writings and Letters. Edited by John Edmund Cox. Cambridge: University Press, 1846.

Cromwell, Oliver. Letters and Speeches. Edited by Thomas Carlyle. Copyright ed. 5 vols. London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1849.

Crosby, Thomas. The History of the English Baptists, from the Reformation to the beginning of the reign of king George I. 4 vols. London: for the Editor, 1738.

Discovery/of a Swarme of Separatists,/or,/a Leathersellers Sermon./Being a most true and exact Relation of the tumultuous combustion in Fleet-Street last Sabboth/day being the 19 of Decem. . . . (8 lines). London: for John Greensmith, 1641.

Edwards, Thomas. Antapologia: or, a Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines . . . (25 lines). London: by G. M., 1643/4.

Edwards, Thomas. Reasons/against the/Independant Government/of Particular/Congregations: As also against the Toleration of such Churches to be erected in this Kingdome. . . . (8 lines). London: Richard Cotes, 1641.

Edwards, Thomas. The First and Second Part of Gangraena: or a Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time, vented and acted in England in these four last yeers. . . . 3rd ed., corrected and much enlarged. London: by T. R. and E. M., 1646.

Featley, Daniel. The Dippers dipt./or,/The Anabaptists/Dvck'd and Plvng'd/ over Head and Eares, . . . (14 lines). 4th ed. London: for Nicholas Bourn, etc., 1646.

Ferriby, John. The Lawfull Preacher:/or a short Discourse:/Proving,/That they only ought to preach who/are ordained Ministers. . . . (12 lines). 2nd Impression corrected and amended. London: for William Roybould, MDCLIII.

Fox, George. Primitive/Ordination/and/Succession,/of/Bishops, Deacons, Pas/tors and Teachers/in the Church of Christ. . . . (12 lines). 1675.

Fox, George. The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox. Edited by Norman Penney. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

Fullwood, Francis. The Churches and Ministery/of England true Churches and true Ministery,/cleared and proved./In a Sermon preach'd the 4th of May/at Wiviliscombe; before a numerous Congregation/assembled together to hear the opposition, which had been long treatned to be made that day, by Mr. Collier/and others of his party, who, with the greatest/strength the West would afford them/were present at the Sermon. . . . (12 lines). London: by A. M., 1652.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson (ed.). The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660. 3rd ed. revised. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.

Gee, Henry, and Hardy, William John, (compilers). Documents Illustrative of English Church History. London: Macmillan & Co., 1914.

Gillespie, George. Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster. Edited by David Meek. Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846.

G. W., Grand/Pluto's/Progresse through/Great Britaine, and Ireland. . . . (9 lines). 1647.

Hall, Thomas. The Pulpit Guarded/with XVII/Arguments/Proving/The Unlawfulness, Sinfulness and Danger of/Suffering Private persons to take upon them Publike/Preaching, and expounding the Scriptures without a Call;/As being contrary to the Word of God, contrary to the practice of all/Reformed Churches, contrary to the Three and twentieth Article of Reli-/gion, contrary to two Ordinances of Parliament, and contrary to/the Judgement of a whole Jury of learned, judicious,/pious Divines, both Forraign and Domestick. . . . (19 lines). London: by J. Cottrel, 1651.

Haller, William, and Davies, Godfrey (eds.). The Leveller Tracts 1647-1653. Columbia: University Press, 1944.

Hartley, William. The Prerogative/Priests Passing-Bell./or Amen to the Rigid Clergy./Shewing the Usefulnesse, Equity, Lawfulness,/and Necessity, of private Persons to take upon them/Preaching or Expounding of the Scriptures, having a Call thereto/by the Word of God, and agreeable to the practise of the best/Reformed Churches of Christ, and Judgment of/judicious Divines both Forraign and/Domestick./Being a brief Reply to that Discourse intituled The Pulpit guarded with 17 Arguments, and owned by Tho Hall. . . . (4 lines). London: by J. M. 1651.

Hutchinson, Lucy. Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson. Edited by Juilus Hutchinson, revised by C. H. Firth. 2 vols. London: John C. Nimno, 1885.

Ireland, Richard. None fit to preach the/gospel but the learned,/such who are taught by the untaught/Teacher the Spirit of Truth, which leads into all truth,/whom the world knows not. . . . (13 lines). London: for the author, 1661.

Ives, Jeremiah. Confidence encountred; or, a vindication of the lawfulness of preaching without ordination. . . . (9 lines). 1658.

Ives, Jeremiah. Confidence Questioned;/or/a brief examination/of some doctrines delivered/by M. Thomas Willes of Bottolphs Billings Gate,/in a sermon preached by him/at Margrets New-Fish-Street,/7 Decemb. 1657./Also some questions touching his pre/tended call and authority to preach the gospel. . . . (8 lines). London: for Daniel White, 1658.

Johnson, Ben. Bartholomew Fair. (1614). Acting Text edited for Old Vic Co. at Edinburgh International Festival of Music & Drama, 1950. Edinburgh: Scots Review.

Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici./or The/Divine Right/of The/Gospel-Ministry:/Divided into two parts./The first Part containing/A Justifi-/cation of The Gospel-Ministry in general./The Necessity of Ordination thereunto by Imposition of hands./The Unlawfulnesse of private mens assuming to themselves/either the office or Work of the Ministry without a lawfull/Call or Ordination. . . . (12 lines). London: by the Provincial Assembly, 1654.

Kem, Major Samuel. Orders given out; the Word,/Stand Fast./as it was lately delivered in a farewell/Sermon/by/Major Samuel Kem, to the officers/and Souldiers of his Regiment in Bristoll./Novemb. 8. 1646. London: by I. M., 1647.

Knappen, M. M., (ed.). Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1933.

Knowles, John. A modest/plea/for private mens/preaching./or/an answer to a booke/intituled, Private Men no pulpit men;/ composed by Giles Workman./wherein/The thing in controversie is briefly debated;/The examination of private mens preaching examined;/also certain accusations wip'd away and removed./By John Knowles/a Preacher of the Gospel, formerly in and neer Glocester, now belonging to the Life-Guard of his Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax. London: 1648.

Lawrance, R. The Wolf Stript/of his/Sheeps Clothing/or/The Anti Christian Clergy-man/turn'd right side outwards. . . . (6 lines). London: 1647.

Lay-divine, or the simple house-preaching taylor who whilest he would seem to divert his brethren from hell, spreads his banner of heresies to lead them thither. London: for W. Ley, 1647.

Lay-Preaching/Unmasked./or a Discourse Tending/to shew the unlawfulness of Lay-/mens preaching in Publique/or Private./being/A Refutation of/some Arguments brought for the Justification/of the lawfulnesse and universall exercise of every/mans gift publique and private:/By a well-willer to Reformation. . . . (2 lines). London: for W. L., 1644.

Lightfoot, John. The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines from January 1, 1643, to December 31, 1644. Edited by John Rogers Pitman. London: J. F. Dove, 1824.

Lucifers/Lacky,/or,/The Devils new Creature,/Being/The true character of a dissembling/Brownist, whose life is hypocriticall, instructi/ous Schismaticall, thoughts dangerous, Actions/malicious, and opinions impious. . . . (3 lines). London: for John Greensmith, 1641.

Lupton, Donald. The freedom of/preaching./Proving that all men endowed with gifts and abilities may teach and preach the word of God. . . . (9 lines). London: by R. W. 1652.

Lyford, William. An/Apologie/for our/Publick Ministerie,/and Infant-Baptism./Written some years ago for Private satisfaction of some Dissenting Brethren; and upon request enlarged and Published for the same ends. London: by William Du gard, 1652.

Mackam, N. The/Vindication/of/ordinary and public/preaching by a Gospel ministry; . . . (8 lines). London: for Thomas Basset, 1657.

Martin, John, and Petto, Samuel, and Woodal, Frederick. The Preacher sent:/or,/A Vindication/of the Liberty of/Publick Preaching,/By some men not ordained. . . . (12 lines). London: for Livewel Chapman, 1658.

Mitchell, Alex F., and Struthers, John (eds.). Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (November 1644 to March 1649). Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1874.

Old/Protestants/Letanie:/Against all Sectaries, and their Defendants,/ Both Presbyterians,/and Independents,/composed by a Lover of God,/ and King Charles. Printed in the yeare of Hope - 1647.

Owen, John. The duty of Pastors and People distinguished./or a Briefe/ Discourse,/Touching the/Administration/of Things Commanded/In Religion. . . . (15 lines). London: by L. N., 1644.

Pagitt, E. Heresiography or A description of the Sectaries of these Latter times. 4th ed. London: by W. L., 1647.

Peel, Albert (ed.). The Seconde Parte of a Register. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1915.

Perkins, W. Of the cal/ling of the Ministerie/Two treatises/describing the duties & digni/ties of that Calling, Delivered Pub/lickly in the Universitie of/Cambridge, by Maister/Perkins./Taken then from his mouth, and/now diligently perused and publi/shed . . . etc., 1605.

Perkins, William. Workes. 3 vols. London: 1618.

Pierce, William (ed.). The Marprelate Tracts 1588, 1589. London: James Clarke & Co., 1911.

Pollard, Alfred W. (ed.). Records of the English Bible, The Documents relating to the translation and publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

Poole, Matthew. Quo Warranto;/or,/a Moderate Enquiry Into The/Warrant-ablenesse/of The/Preaching/of/Gifted and Unordained Persons. . . . (15 lines). London: by J. H., 1658.

Prothero, G. W. (ed.). Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents, Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Prynne, W. A Fresh Discovery of some Prodigious New Wandring-Blasing-Stars & Firebrands, stiling themselves New Lights, Firing our Church and State into New Combustions, . . . (20 lines). London: by John Macock, 1645.

Reliquiae Baxterianae:/or/Mr. Richard Baxter's/Narrative/of/the most Memorable Passages/of His/Life/and/Times/Faithfully Publish'd from his own original Manuscript,/By Matthew Sylvester . . . (5 lines). London: for T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, J. Lawrence, and J. Dunton., 1696.

Robinson, John. Works of John Robinson, Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers. Memoir and annotations by Robert Ashton. 3 vols. London: John Snow, 1851.

Rutherford, Samuel. A/Free Disputation/Against pretended/Liberty of Conscience/Tending/To Resolve Doubts moved by Mr. John/Goodwin, John Baptist, Dr. Jer. Taylor, the Belgick Arminians, Socinians, and other Authors/contending for lawlesse Liberty, or licen-/tious Toleration of Sects and Heresies. . . . (5 lines). London: by R. I., 1649.

Seaman, Lazarus. A Vindication/of the Judgement of the Reformed/Churches, and Protestant Divines,/From misrepresentations/Concerning ordination, and/Laying on of hands./Together with a brief Answer to the Pretences of Edmond Chillenden, for the/lawfulnesse of Preaching without/ordination. London: by T. R., 1647.

Sermon/and/Prophecie/of/Mr. James Hunt/of the County of Kent/who professeth himselfe a Prophet,/Which hee hath endeavoured to deliver in most Churches in/and about London, but since delivered in the Old-Baily./Octob. 9. 1641. Printed for Thomas Bates, 1641.

Shakespeare, William. As You Like It. (Hardin Craig, Shakespeare, New York: Scott Foreman & Co., 1931).

Sheppard, William. The/Peoples Priviledge/and Duty Guarded/Against The/Pulpit and Preachers Incroachment./and/Their Sober Justification and Defence/of their free and open Exposition of Scriptures. . . . (8 lines). London: for T. Brewster, 1652.

Smyth, John. Works of John Smyth, Fellow of Christ's College, 1594-8. Edited with notes and biography by W. T. Whitley. 2 vols. Tercentenary ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1915.

Spencer, John. A Short/Treatise/concerning the/lawfulness of every mans/exercising his gift as God shall/call him thereunto. London: for Iohn Spencer, 1641.

Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other various occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign . . . (3 lines). a new edition. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1827.

Taylor, Jeremy. A/Discourse/of/The Liberty of Prophesying./Shewing/The Unreasonableness/of prescribing to other mens Faith, and the/Iniquity of persecuting differing opinions/By Ier. Taylor, D. D., Chaplaine in ordinarie to His Majestie. London: for R. Royston, 1647.

T., T. A Tale/in a/Tub/or a Tub/Lecture/As it was delivered by My-heele Mendsoale,/an Inspired Brownist, and a most upright/Translator./In a meeting house neere Bedlam, the one and/twentieth of December, Last, 1641. London: 1641.

Taylor, Iohn. The/Whole Life and Progresse of Henry Walker the Ironmonger. . . . (8 lines). London: 1642.

Taylor, John. A Cluster of/Coxcombes,/or/Cinquepace of five sorts of Knaves and Fooles: Namely,/The Donatists, Publicans, Disciplinarians, Anabaptists, and Brownists;/Their Originals, opinions, confutations/and (in a word) their/Heads Roundly jolted together. . . . (5 lines). Printed for Richard Webb, 1642.

Taylor, John. A/Swarme/of/Sectaries and/Schismatiques:/Wherein is discovered the strange preaching (or prating) of such as are by their trades/Coblers, Tinkers, Pedlers, Weavers, Sow/gelders, and Chymney-Sweepers. . . . (4 lines). 1641.

Taylor, John (?). A full and compleat Answer/against the Writer of a late Volume/set forth, entitled A Tale in a Tub,/or a Tub Lecture with a Vindication/of that rediculous name called/Round-Heads. . . . (3 lines) by Thorny Ailo. London: for F. Cowles, T. Bates, and T. Banks, 1642.

Taylor, J. (?). An/Apology/for Private/Preaching./In which those Formes are warranted, or rather justified, which/the malignant Sect contemne, and daily by/prophane Pamphlets make ridiculous . . . (10 lines). Printed for R. Wood, T. Wilson, and E. Christopher, 1641 (?).

Taylor, John (?). An Honest/Answer/To The Late Published/Apologie/For/ Private Preaching./Wherein,/Is justly refuted their mad Forms of Doctrine:/(As,) Preaching in a Tub./Teaching against the backe of a chaire./Instructing at a Tables end./Revealing in a Basket./Exhorting over a Buttery Hatch./Reforming on a Bed side. . . . (9 lines). Printed for R. Wood, T. Wilson, and E. Christopher, 1642.

Taylor, John (?). New/Preachers,/New./Greene the Feltmaker, Spencer the Horse-/Rubber, Quartermine the Brewers Clarke, with/some few others, that are mighty sticklers in this new/kinde of talking Trade, which many ignorant/Coxcombes call Preaching. . . .(4 lines). 1641.

Taylor, John (?). The/Brownists/Synagogue/or a Late/Discovery/of their conventicles, assemblies; and places of meeting,/where they Preach, and the manner of their praying and preaching/with a Relation of the Names, places and Doctrines of/those which doe commonly Preach. . . . (5 lines). 1641.

Terrill, Edward. The Records of a Church of Christ Meeting in Broadmead, Bristol, 1640-1688. Edited by Nathaniel Haycroft. London: J. Heaton & Son, 1865.

Tub-preachers overturn'd,/or/Independency to be abandoned and abhor'd/ as destructive to the Majestracy & ministery, of the church and commonwealth, of England . . . (23 lines). London: for George Lindsey, 1647.

Walker, Henry. The Modest/Vindication/of Henry Walker/In answer to certaine scandalous Pamphlets, forged/and vented abroad in his name (without his privity.) . . . (8 lines). London: 1642.

Whitefield, Thomas. A/Refutation/of the/Loose Opinions, and Licentious Tenets/wherwith those Lay-preachers which wander/up and downe the Kingdome, labour to/seduce the simple People. . . .(15 lines). London: for John Bellamie, 1646.

Whitelocke. Memorials of the English Affairs: or, An Historical Account of what passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles the First, to King Charles the Second His Happy Resauration. new ed. London: for J. Tonson. 1732.

Word to Fanatics, Puritans and Sectaries, Green the Felt-maker, Spencer the Horse-rubber, and a few others, in this new kinde of trade, which many ignorant Coxcombs call Preaching, whereunto is added the last Tumult in Fleet Street, caused by the preachment and pratings of Barbones the Leather-seller. 1641.

Woodal, Frederick, and Petto, Samuel. A/Vindication/of/The/Preacher Sent,/or/A Warrant for Publick Preach-/ing without Ordination./ Wherein is further discovered That some/Gifted men unordained, are Gospel Preachers . . . (12 lines). London: by J. T. Livewell Chapman, 1659.

Woodbridge, Benjamin (?). Church-members/Set In/Joynt/or,/A Discovery of the unwarrantable and/disorderly practice of private Christians,/ in usurping the peculiar office and work/of Christs own Pastours, namely/Publike Preaching . . . (11 lines) by Filodexter Transilvanus. London: for Edmund Paxton, 1648.

Woodhouse, A. S. P. (ed.). Puritanism and Liberty, Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the CLARKE MANUSCRIPTS with Supplementary Documents. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1938.

Workman, Giles. Private-men no Pulpit-men:/or,/A Modest Examination/of/ Lay-Mens Preaching./Discovering it to be neither warranted by the/ Word of God; nor allowed by the Judgement, or/Practise, of the Churches of Christ/in New England. . . . (6 lines). London: by F. Neile, 1646.

Wyclif, John. Select English Writings. Edited by Herbert E. Winn. Oxford: University Press, 1929.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Anderson, Christopher. The Annals of the English Bible. 2 vols. London: William Pickering, 1845.

Braithwaite, William C. The Beginnings of Quakerism. London: Macmillan & Co., 1912.

Brittain, Vera. In The Steps of John Bunyan, An Excursion into Puritan England. London: Rich and Cowan. n. d.

Brown, John. John Bunyan (1628-1688) His Life, Times, and Work. Tercentenary edition revised by Frank Mott Harrison. London: Hulbert Publishing Co., 1928.

Brown John. Puritan Preaching in England, A Study of Past and Present. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1900.

Buchan, John. Oliver Cromwell. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1937.

Burnet, Bishop. History of the Reformation of the Church of England. a new edition. 6 vols. London: by J. F. Dove, 1820.

Burrage, Champlin. The Early English Dissenters In the Light of Recent Research (1550-1641). 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.

Campell, William. "The Scottish Westminster Commissioners and Toleration." Records of the Scottish Church History Society. vol. IX, Part 1, 1945.

Chambers, R. W. Thomas More. London: Jonathan Cape, 1935.

Clark, Henry W. History of English Nonconformity from Wiclif to the close of the Nineteenth Century. 2 vols. London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1911.

Constant, G. La Réforme En Angleterre: Le Schisme Anglican. Paris: Librairie Académique, 1930.

Constant, G. The Reformation in England (Introduction of the Reformation into England Edward VI (1547-1553). Translated by E. I. Watkin. London: Sheed & Ward, 1914.

Dale, R. W. History of English Congregationalism. Edited by A. W. W. Dale. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1907.

Dargan, Edwin Charles. A History of Preaching. 2 vols. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1905.

Darwin, Francis D. S. The English Mediaeval Recluse. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, n. d.

Davies, Horton. The Worship of the English Puritans. dacre press Westminster, 1948.

Dearmer, Percy, "The Church of England and the Reformation." vol. III An Outline of Christianity. Edited by Peak & Parsons. London: The Waverly Book Co., n. d.

Demaus, R. William Tyndale. new ed. revised by Richard Lovett. London: Religious Tract Soc., 1886.

Dexter, Henry Martyn. The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, As Seen in Its Literature. London: Hodden & Stoughton, 1879.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen. 53 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1885.

Dixon, Richard Watson. History of the Church of England. 6 vols. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1881.

Drysdale, A. H. History of the Presbyterians in England. London: Publication Committee of Presbyterian Church of England, 1889.

Emmott, Elizabeth Braithwaite. A Short History of Quakerism. London: Swarthmore Press, 1923.

Firth, C. H. Cromwell's Army: A History of the English Soldier During the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. 2nd ed. London: Methuen & Co., 1912.

Firth, C. H. Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England. London: Putnam, 1947.

Firth, Charles Harding. The Last Years of the Protectorate 1656-1658. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909.

Foxe, John. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. Edited by Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley. London: R. B. Seeley & W. Burnside, 1837.

Frere, W. H. The English Church, in the Reigns of Elizabeth & James I. (1558-1625). London: Macmillan & Co., 1924.

Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain, from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the year MDCXLVIII. 3rd ed. 3 vols. London: James Nichols, 1842.

Gairdner, James. Lollardy and the Reformation in England. An Historical Survey. 4 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., 1908.

Gairdner, James. The English Church, In the Sixteenth Century From the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1904.

Gardiner, Samuel R. History of the Great Civil War 1642-1649. 4 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1894.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. Oliver Cromwell. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1901.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan. The Eve of the Reformation. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., Ltd., 1900.

Gee, Henry. The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion, 1558-1564. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.

Green, E. Tyrrell. The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1896.

Greenslade, S. L. The Work of William Tindale. London: Blackie & Son, Ltd., 1938.

Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism, or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Hardwick, Charles. A History of the Articles of Religion. London: F. &. J. Rivington, 1851.

Heaton, W. J. The Bible of the Reformation. London: Francis Griffiths, 1913.

Henson, H. Hensley. Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century. London: John Murray, 1903.

Hetherington, W. W. History of the Church of Scotland. 4th ed. Edinburgh: John Johnstone, 1844.

Horne, C. Silvester. A Popular History of the Free Churches. 3rd ed. London: James Clarke & Co., 1903.

Hutton, William Holden. A History of The English Church, from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714). London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1903.

Jessopp, Augustus. The Coming of the Friars. London: Ernest Benn, 1888, 21st impression 1930.

Jordan, W. K. The Development of the Religious Toleration In England From the beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1932.

Knappen, M. M. Tudor Puritanism. University of Chicago, 1939.

Knox, R. A. Enthusiasm, A Chapter in the History of Religion, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.

Lechler, Gotthard. John Wycliffe and His English Precursors. Translated by Peter Lorimer, a new edition, revised. London: Religious Tract Society, 1884.

Little, A. G. Studies in English Franciscan History. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1917.

Lumpkin, William Latane. The Local Baptist Confessions of Faith of the Civil War--Commonwealth Period. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Edinburgh, 1948.

Manning, Bernard Lord. The People's Faith in the Time of Wyclif. Cambridge: University Press, 1919.

Marsden, J. B. The History of the Early Puritans: From the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War in 1642. 2 vols. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1850.

Masson, David. The Life of John Milton: Narrated in connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of His Times. 6 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., 1871-1877.

Miller, Perry, and Johnson, Thomas H. The Puritans. New York; American Book Co., 1938.

Mitchell, W. Fraser. English Pulpit Oratory, from Andrews to Tillotson. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932.

Moorman, John Richard Humpidge. Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century. Cambridge: University Press, 1946.

Morley, John. Oliver Cromwell. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1900.

Mozley, J. F. William Tyndale. London: Society fro Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937.

Neal, Daniel. History of the Puritans. 2 vols. London: for J. Buckland, 1754.

Nuttall, Geoffrey F. The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Owst, G. R. Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters and of the English People. Cambridge: University Press, 1933.

Owst, G. R. Preaching in Medieval England An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period C. 1350-1450. Cambridge: University Press 1926.

Payne, Ernest A. The Baptists of Berkshire, London: Carey Kingsgate Press, Ltd., 1951.

Pearson, A. F. Scott. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism 1535-1603. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

Pollard, A. F. The History of England From the Accession of Edward VI To the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603). Vol. VI of The Political History of England edited by William Hunt and Reginald L. Poole. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910.

Previté-Orton, C. W., and Brooke, Z. N. (eds.). Cambridge Medieval History. 8 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1936.

Price, Thomas. The History of Protestant Nonconformity in England, from the Reformation under Henry VIII. 2 vols. London: 1836.

Rashall, Hastings. "Wycliffe." vol. LXIII Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Sidney Lee. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1900.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. Life and Faith of the Baptists. London: Methuen & Co., 1927.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Russell Elbert. The History of Quakerism. New York: Macmillan Co., 1942.

Schenk, W. The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1948.

Schneider, Herbert Wallace. The Puritan Mind. London: Constable & Co., 1931.

Scott, Sir Walter. Woodstock or The Cavalier. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., n. d.

Seebohm, Frederic. The Oxford Reformers of 1498: Being a History of the Fellow-work of John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1867.

Sergeant, Lewis. John Wyclif, Last of the Schoolmen and First of the English Reformers. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893.

Smith, G. Gregory. Ben Johnson. "English Men of Letters." London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1919.

Soames, Henry. Elizabethan Religious History. London: John W. Parker, 1839.

Soames, Henry. The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. London: for C. & J. Rivington, 1826.

Strype, John. Ecclesiastical Memorials; Relating Chiefly to Religion and its Reformation Under the Reigns of King Henry VIII. Edward VI. and Queen Mary the First. 7 vols. London: for Samuel Bagster, MDCCCXVI.

Strype, John. The Life and Acts of John Whitgift. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822.

Sykes, Norman. The Crisis of the Reformation. London: John Heritage, The Unicorn Press, 1938.

Tanner, J. R. English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century 1603-1689. Cambridge: University Press, 1948.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. England in the Age of Wycliffe. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1899.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. England Under the Stuarts. 20th ed. London: Methuen & Co., 1947.

Trevelyan, G. M. English Social History, a Survey of Six Centuries Chaucer to Queen Victoria. New Impression. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. History of England. 3rd ed. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1945.

Trotter, Eleanor. Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish, with special reference to Local Government. Cambridge: University Press, 1919.

Tylor, Charles. Tares and Wheat, A Memorial of John Wycliffe. 2nd ed. London: Headley Brothers, 1898.

Underwood, A. C. A History of the English Baptists. London: Kingsgate Press, 1947.

Vaughan, Robert. John De Wycliffe, a Monograph. London: Seeleys, 1853.

Vaughan, Robert. The Life and Opinions of John De Wycliffe. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London: Holdsworth and Ball, 1831.

Waddington, John. Congregational History, 1567-1700 in Relation to Contemporaneous Events, and the Conflict for Freedom, Purity, and Independence. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1874.

Ward, A. W., Prothero, G. W., and Leathes, Stanley (eds.). Cambridge Modern History. Cambridge: University Press, 1902.

Whitley, W. T. A History of British Baptists. London:Charles Griffin & Co., Ltd., 1923.

Whitley, W. T. The English Bible Under the Tudor Sovereigns. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., n. d.

Workman, Herbert B. John Wyclif. A Study of the English Medieval Church. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.